

# ROBERT BARCLAY'S APOLOGY

For the true CHRISTIAN Divinity Vindicated

From  
JOHN BROWN'S  
Examination and pretended confutation thereof,  
in his book, called,

## QUAKERISME

The Path-Way to  
PAGANISME.

*In which VINDICATION*

*I. B.* his many gross *perversions* and *abuses* are discovered,  
and his *furious* and *violent Railings* and *Revilings*  
soberly rebuked, By *R. B.*

*Whereunto is added*

A Christian and Friendly Expostulation with ROBERT MACQUARE, touching his Postscript to the said book of *J. B.* written to him by LILLIAS SKEIN, wife of *Alexander Skein*, and delivered some moneths since at his house in Rotterdam.

*Maiah 51: 7.* Hearken unto me, ye, that know righteousness, the People, in whose heart is my Law, fear ye not the reproach of men, neither be ye afraid of their revilings.

*Match. 5: 11.* Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and speak all manner of evil falsely against you for my Name's sake.

---

Printed in the Year. 1679.

And are to be sold by Benjamin Clerk, Stationer, in Georgyard Lumberstreet;  
At LONDON.

PHOTOLOGY

PHOTOLOGY



The P R E F A C E  
To the  
R E A D E R.

Serious *R E A D E R*,

**I** shall not need to trouble thee here with a long Preface, most of what is commonly inserted in such Epistles being proposed to thee in the first Section, onely I will take occasion here, ingenuously and solemnly to profess that no delight in controversy hath induced me to undertake this Treatise, but pure necessity, to vindicate the Truth, professed by me, from the many gross perversions wherewith this Author hath abused it. For as for his Personal Reflections at me, which are very frequent, and whereby he labours to represent me to his Reader, as *the veryest Fool, Ignorant, Senseless, Non-sensical, and yet Proud, Presumptuous and blasphemous Miscreant* (for such are his expressions) *that can be imagined*; I should not have troubled my self nor the world with a Vindication, being perswaded none who truly knows me, will believe him, and that none of solidity and judgment, who knows me not, will so easily agree to his Censur: as for such credulous creaturs (if his book find any such, for I have heard of severals of the same faith with him, who much condemn his *Railing* still) who will judge of me upon so small and suspicious evidence, I must be contented, as many better men have been before me, to abide the rash judgment of those inconsiderat Souls. As for the book, from which he assumes

\* 2

and

## The P R E F A C E.

and pronounces this character of me, thou wilt find it here vindicated, and see that hideous masque, wherewith he laboured to veil it, that he might rail the more securely, taken off. I could easily shew the lightness of his judgement, by filling the other scale with a *pressed-down measur* of the Testimonys, both by word and write, of several Persons at home and abroad, who are not *Quakers*, and yet such, to whom without disparagement he must give the precedency, both for *Parts, Piety and Learning*; but I desire not to raise my reputation that way; it is his work that needs a Postscript of that nature: and truely he hath saved me this paines, while at other times he manifestly implies a contradiction to this character, while he persuades the Reader of the necessity he was under to write so great a Volumn, as if the whole Christian Commonwealth had been in danger to be overturned, and many Souls in hazard to be hurt by the *Quakers* (among whom both he and his brother *R. M. C.* give me and my writings a chief place, as their *Goliath*, patron, sharpest and neatest pen) if not seasonably supplied by this his antidot. For sure had it been so inconsistent and contradictory a piece of work, as he sometimes represents it to be, as being written by so silly and pittypfull an *Ignoramus*, as he is sometimes pleased to term me, there could not have been so great cause of fear, nor such need of so great a volumn, especially to such as could not understand mine, being not yet extant in a language they skilled, to whom he principally directs his, and though they had, could have no great hurt, if he speak true, when he represents me frequently to write things unintelligible, and yet he is so wise as to apprehend he has refuted what he confesses he doth not understand. But the reason of his thus contradicting himself is, that, albeit his  
ma-

## To the READER.

malice to the Truth and my self, was such, that he could not say enough to render both it and me despicable, yet forgetting himself at other times, he was forced to acknowledge what I say considerable, that he might render his own work of some value, and himself a champion, which he could never have done, albeit he might be supposed to have rebuked and refuted a piece of pittifull non-sense. Thus the man, while he stretcheth to exalt himself, and abase me; overturns, on the one part, what he affirms on the other: but if he can have so far pity upon himself, as to think in time, of repenting, I do with my whole heart freely forgive him, and whether he do, or not, I can assure him, as I should never have valued my self upon his commendation, so I am nothing moved by his abuses, save only to pity and commiserat him. I must entreat this of the Reader, that, if he desire to be fully informed in this controversy, he will be pleased first to read my *Apolo-logy*, which for his benefit will I hope be extant in our own language, ere this comes to his hands, and then perhaps he will little need an antidot against the pretended confutation, but if any scruple there remain, it will easily be removed by seriously perusing this Vindication. And because before his book he placeth a great list of that he accounts the blasphemous assertions of the *Quakers*, that so he may prepossess his Reader with prejudice at the very entry, to remove which, thou wilt find inserted at the end a List of so many of them as are utterly false, besides many of them are Perversions, & not owned in the terms he asserts them, & yet a great part of them he pretends not so much as to deduce from any words written by me, but has fished for them in the writings of others of our adversaries, which piece of injustice is in the last Section demonstrated. Not desiring to detain thee any longer, I shall

## To the READER.

only wish the God of all Grace to minister to thee such a  
measur thereof, and give thee such Light and understanding  
by the holy influence of his Divine Spirit, that thou mayst,  
for his Glory and thy Soul's Salvation make a right judgment  
of the present Controversy, and come truly to discern which  
doctrin it is, and who speaks most consonantly to the Holy  
Scripturs,

*So wisheth he, who is a real friend to all men,*

R. B.

R. B.



## ADVERTISEMENT.

**I**T is hoped that the more moderat, sober and serious among the *Presbyterian* Preachers, and who have a true regard as wel to the Peace of their own Consciences as to the Christian reputation of their cause and interest among sober and honest Christians, will shew their readyness to do justice to themselves, as wel as right to the injured Author of this Treatise, not only in respect to the appeal added to the end of the last Section, but also to the many other gross abuses, falsehoods and railings detected herein, to be most impudently asserted by *John Brown*, since he comes forth under no less character than a *Presbyterian*; *David*, and that given him by so eminent a man as *Robert Macquarie* is reputed among them: which justice is also the more hoped for, since the more moderat *Presbyterians* have themselves felt the fruit of *J. B.* his violent, furious and unchristian temper, in his fomenting Divisions among them, and encouraging *Cameron* by his Letter, whom they repute an Heady, Turbulent Incendiary, and the effects of whose work strengthened by *J. B.* have produced no small mischief both to the Cause in general, and to many poor People, who have been thereby ruined, if the occasion some of themselves represent of the late rising in *Scotland* be true.

## ERRATA.

The *Reader* is desired to correct these following Errors, which have escaped the Press: other literal ones, which do not so much touch the sense, are left to his discretion, and if any others considerable have not been observed and here remarked, it is hoped the courteous Reader will not impute them to the Author, because of his absence from the Press.

In the Preface, page 1. line 20. for *still* read *style*. P. 3. l. 24. for *which* r. *them*. P. 4. l. 6. r. *who that speaks*. ---- In the Book, Pag. 16. l. ult. r. *owne*. P. 17. l. last save two, r. *sects*. P. 22. l. 6. r. *do*. P. 23. l. last but two, r. *preparatory*. P. 26 l. 25. after *may* d. *not*. P. 32. l. 4. d. *of*. P. 34. l. 25. r. *stirits*. d. *of*. P. 43. l. 26. r. *bonds*. P. 57. l. 9. r. *aready*. P. 68. l. 9. r. *lin*. P. 83. l. 11. d. *by which*. P. 88. l. 11. r. *he*. P. 102. l. 3. after *it*, read *not*. P. 70. l. 2. add after *dye* for *themselves*; *If he mean a natural death; but if not, I see no reason of admitting his figure, nor is there any strength in it to prove that it imports his dying in their room and stead, as he would have it*. P. 98. l. 34. r. *it*. P. 101. l. 14. r. *say*. l. 15. r. *it*. P. 110 l. 28. r. *fine*. P. 113. l. 16. d. *by*. P. 135. l. 16. r. *by Papists against Protestants*. Pag. 184. l. 15. r. *he hath but said it*. l. 18. r. *so as all*. P. 192. l. ult. r. *and*. P. 163. l. 17. for *proof* read *reply*. P. 180. l. 3. r. *corruptions*. P. 175. l. 34. for *and* r. *add*.

R. B's.

## A P O L O G Y

For the true Christian Divinity  
V I N D I C A T E D

From


J. B's. Examination and pretended  
Confutation thereof, in his book,

Called

QUAKERISME the path-way to PAGANISME.

## Section. I.

Containing the Introduction, and the Method, the Author proposeth to himself, in this Treatise; with the reasons wherefore; together with some general Considerations relating to *J. B's.* whole book, and Remarks on his Epistle to the Reader.

¶ 1.  Among the many evils, that abound amongst those, that bear the name of *Christians*, this is a great one, that, in the unhappy difference they have among themselves, there appears so much *malice*, *bitterness* and *envy*; and so little of that *candor* and *sincerity*, true and unmixed *zeal*, and of the *meekness*, *peaceableness* and *gentleness* of *Jesus*: so that there is often-times observed an eager willingness to represent their Opposits other ways than they are. But, among all sorts of such, as profess Christianity, I know none have more reason to complain

A

plain

plain of this abuse, than we; who, albeit we have not a little laboured to make known to all, the *plain Truth*, held by us; yet our words have been most miserably perverted upon many occasions, and we most horribly misrepresented, as is abundantly manifest to many, who are acquainted with the books writ against us, and our answers: wherein many, if not most, of the arguments used against us are not levelled at those things we truly hold, but at the monstrous and horrid conceptions, which our adversaries have framed to themselves, and then would needs fasten upon us, as our Principles and doctrines. Many of us have been thus exercised in the controversys, wherein we have been concerned, and I myself, in some small rencountres that have heretofore fallen to my share, have had my part, but I confess inferior to many of my Brethren. But now that I. B.'s work appears, I think (considering the bulk and nature of it, hereafter more particularly to be viewed) I may come up with most. For I scarce think that ever a man's words were so horridly and constantly throughout perverted, or that ever a book of controversy, of its bulk, *to wit*, (as I take it) betwixt 70 and 80 sheets of paper, was so stuffed with a continuall strain of *Railing*, from the very first page unto the last. Yet, when we consider the man's design, which appears from the nature of his work, perhaps there will be less occasion of wonder.

¶ For either he, or some brother of his abroad, having, without any provocation from us, the People called *Quakers*, fallen into the most gross and vilest sort of railing against us, in a *Postscript* to S. R.'s *Letters*, and that without the least offer of probation, it seems they judged themselves concerned to give the people some reason for their so doing. And there could not be a finer knack to beguile the credulous and implicit Multitude, than to answer a book writ in *Latine*, and not extant in their Mother-tongue: for there a man, as to them, (who can not read, understand, and compare it with that, to which it relates) may pervert words, as he will, draw consequences at pleasure; and make to himself what monsters best please his fancy, or like his humour best to batter. And yet he can not find in it by all his perverting enough to make us so black, as he would have us, so that he is often-times constrain'd to fish for this, by citing the writings of some, that have writ against us, and bring us up some of their old thread-bare calumnys, long ago answered by us: in which his injustice shall be afterwards observed. And so he, being thus furnished, can the more easily abuse, especially while he is almost secure, that the



## The Introduction.

3

the generality of those he writes to, are such, as will not call in question, as to the truth of it, what is said by one esteemed by them *a pretious and gracious Minister, and sufferer for the good cause, to boot.* But (blessed be God!) the number of such implicit believers groweth daily less, and many (that had wont to do other-wise) begin to love to see with their own eyes, and not to pin their faith so much upon the *Clergy's* sleeve, as they had used formerly to do. For this cause, had I had to do only with the more judicious and Learned, who could have wel understood the *Latine* edition, I should have thought my self the less concerned to have said any thing to this answer: But knowing that his may come to the hands of many, and may be read by them, who do not understand *Latine*: and that not a few, who do understand it, love rather to read and consider things in their own language; this made me hasten an English edition (not one sheet whereof was committed to the press several weeks after I. B's book came out) and now it being abroad, as to those, who are diligent and judicious, and willing seriously to compare, as to the argumentative part, I should not be much concerned to answer him, judging the English edition, with all such, a sufficient reply to this pretended examination, however he often-times sings a triumph to himself, saying in many places, *What will our Quaker say now?* Contrary to the rules of sobriety, and to what the Scriptur teaches him, saying, *Let not him boast, that puts on his armour, but he that takes it off,* besides what his brother, in a most fawning flattering manner, adds in his Postscript. (To which something may be said hereafter.) But, because too many out of malice, prejudice and ignorance, may be too apt to credit him, I resolve here to take notice of his *gross perversions and abuses* upon every *These*, and of his *most unreasonable and brutish railing*, which being subjected to the Readers view, will give him a great in-sight in the matter, and let him see what kind of man this is, and what kind of work it is that comes from him. And likewise in respect he insults very much, I may labour to allay it, in taking notice of his chiefeft arguments, that are any ways to the purpose. This I know will satisfy the moderat and judicious, who bring not along with them an understanding already prepossessed, but are willing patiently to hear both partys, and then make a judgment accordingly. And as for others, who are wholly prepossessed with malice and prejudice, and have no ears to hear, but (according to the Author of the Postscript his advice) *avoid the least of that kind as poyson*: I say, as for such, I wish the

Lord open their eyes, and give them a heart more just and equal, I shall not be much concerned if my writing have no great influence upon them at present.

¶ But, if any strange that so small a Treatise, as this may seem to be, should answer so great a bulk, the considering of these particulars following will easily remove that wonder.

1. If we consider how much is taken up in meer railing, of which few pages are found free, and somtimestmes takes up near the whole page, besides that almost every paragraph ends with a dish of this desert: saying, *O what hell-hatched heresies these abominable Quakers maintain!* and the like: besides many little sentences, such as, *This is an answer fit for a Quaker. This is like the Quakers non-sense. I see the Quakers can dream waking,* and such like stuff. I need not set down pages to prove this, for, as thou wilt find a specimen of it in the first half side to the Reader, so indeed thou'lt scarce open the book but thou wilt meet with it: so that I may safely say, to speak within bounds, there are 20 sheets (if it were all put together) that are meer railing, either by way of admiration, detestation, or execration, which have nothing of argumentation, neither from Scriptur nor Reason, but the meer strong *affirmo* of the asserter; all which (albeit I may remark it as I go on) I think not my self concerned to answer, nor do I conceive will any sober man judge I am, and my answer thereto, as now to the bulk of it, so may perhaps prove not much more all along, than *The Lord rebuke that railing spirit in thee I. B., and, if it may stand with his will, redeem thee from it, that thou mayst learn sobriety, of that Grace of God thou so much fightst against.* It is a trade I love not, nor do I skill or think to learn it, I will readily grant him both the preference and victory in this art of *Billingsat's rhetoric*, or, to speak yet more plain to all our Scots capacitys, of *kail-wives, oratory*. So I say, Let all this railing in his book be laid aside: and whereas he would insinuat in severall places, as if there were much railing in my Apology, saying, *I rage*, and such like expressions, how great an abuse this is, I leave to the judgment of the intelligent Reader.

2. If all his excursions be laid aside, wherein he runneth out oftentimes into long homilies, by way of explanation of their judgment, decanting upon the severall opinions of their Divines, as he calls them, in which he often-times not only bestowes severall pages, but sometimes divers sheets, as in its place may be observed. In all which tedious preachments

## Sect. I.

## The Introduction.

5

ments (some whereof are may be *shies* of old rusty sermons, that have been lying by him) I think my self no more concerned, than if the man had writt a great volumn of their *Divinity*, which I should not perhaps have bestowed the pains to read, far less lookt upon it as my business to answer it.

3. If all his citations out of *Hicks*, *Faldo* and others, that have written against us, all which are long ago answered, though not heeded by him, were laid aside, which is not only most impertinent, but likewise unjust, (as shall be after more particularly observed) and likewise his long citations out of the *Westminster confession of faith* and *larger Catechism*, a good part whereof he hath transcribed and inserted in his book, albeit it had been a great deal easier to have cited the chapters, and referred to them, the book being so common: but it seems it pleaseth the man's humour, to see a great bulk go under his name, however it be filled up.

4. Lastly: If his many *perversions* be considered, wherein he either willfully or ignorantly mistakes my meaning, and sets up to himself a man of straw, and then batters at it: I say, this being laid aside, which takes up no small part of his work, will make a considerable abatement. Now all these things considered, and all this *superfluous* and *chaffy stuff* being laid aside, which is little or nothing to the purpose, the Reader will find that what remaineth will go into a pretty narrow compass, and bear no great disproportion, if any at all, with these my observations.

¶ 4. But, ere I make an end of this *section*, I judge it needfull to take some notice of his *Epistle*, where the manner of his introduction is very odd. Men use to be sober and moderat, that write controversys, in the beginning at least, and not seek to prepossess the Reader with prejudice against their adversaries, untill, by the strength of their *Reasons*, they have proven them to deserve it: but this man is so full fraughted with *malice*, and so in love with *railing*, that he can not forbear the first page, where we have him calling us *Locusts*, of whose ministry the Devil makes use, only *Masculine in Malice against Christ*, &c. ----- *breathing forth nothing but that Putrid poison, that innate Serpentine Venom*, &c. And of this strain is the whole of his *Epistle*, where we are termed *Apostat-Quakers*, *Runagado Quakers*, &c. But methinks it should have been more *rational*, to have forborn this untill he had proved us such, and not to have begun thus to rail without the least probation. But however this may take with *malicious* or *credulous persons*, it will give the *Judicious* a sufficient tast of the nature

Pag. 2 &  
3.

of his work, and we are not afraid of great prejudice by this kind of arguing. But as he goes on, he gives us a clear specimen of what spirit he is of, and abundantly shewes, that, if either he had power, or were able to influence the *Magistrat* thereunto, he would have saved himself the labour of all this *confutation*, by making short, in cutting us all off. For since he represents us not only as the *worst* and *vilest* of *heretiks*, but as the *sworn* and *most desperat enemies* of *Jesus Christ* in all his offices, we need not doubt, considering his judgment expressed in the case of *Liberty of Conscience*, what he would have done with us. And albeit it might have been judged that in prudence he should have let it alone, untill that place where it seemed to be most proper, and only might be inferred by way of consequence, yet in this, as in most other things, his *malice* outdoes his *prudentials*, and therefore he can not let 3 pages pass, and that in the Epistle, till he discover his temper in this; for there he tells us a story of a *Turk*, who caused punish a Jew for blaspheming of Christ, to the shame of Christians, who have not so much zeal, &c. ----- and a redress of this (saith he) is called for at the hands of one and other, according to their Place and Station. The language of this is sufficiently understood, and beareth no small reflexion upon *Magistrats*, as not being so forward to persecut, as I. B. would have them. And, if we consider that flood of railing that followes, the application is easy: and then, as he goes on, he takes a very convenient way that he may rail securely and calumniat without fear of being discovered, for he would fright People from so much as coming near us, yea he will have all fleeing from us more hastily than from persons having the black botch (such is his comely expression) yea and under the dreadfull hazard of incurring *Anathema Maranatha*, so much as to enter into a friendly communing with us, give us the least token of kindness and affection by word or deed! (What! not feed us, if ready to starve? or cloath us, if naked? which Christ commands all his Disciples to do to their greatest enemies.) But how would this man have a husband behaving towards his wife, or a wife towards her husband, if, turning

Prov. 25:  
ver. 21.  
Matth. 5:  
44.  
Rom. 12:  
20.  
Rom. 7:2.  
Eph. 5:  
ver. 25.

Quaker, they must shew one another no token of kindness and affection either in word or deed, when the Apostle encourages Christian husbands and wives to live with one another respectively, if they be willing, albeit professed Heathens and open Idolaters? But with him, they must not so much as shew a token, so much as by one cast of the eye, far less by more homely discourings: and after the same manner a little after, he would have all forbear so much as looking into our writings, to which, according to his ordinary

## The Introduction.

7

nary stile, he gives such epithets as his railing Genius affords him; a very ready way for him to *belye* and *calumniat* us at pleasur. But upon this occasion I would ask him this question, *If he judgeth it reasonable, that he, that readeth his Examination should look into the Apology to which it relates, or unto that which is said by way of reply to it, or if he would have them taking all upon trust from him?* Were not this a brave way of examining controversys? and doth not this fairly lead to the blind ignorance and implicitness of the Church of Rome, and to the custom of the Turks and Mahumet's rule? (whom he hath so often in his mouth.) I would willingly know if the man would avow himself so *irrational*, as to require or desire this of any body in their wits: and yet he must be so irrational, or otherwise allow the breaking of the Rules he so earnestly presseth.

¶ 5. After he has proceeded at the same rate of railing, accusing us of *Devilry*, and what not, (as for the number of the *poisonous assertions*, which he saith he has gathered together, it shall be spoken of hereafter, and his *gross abuse* therein detected.) he comes at last to apprehend that *some will think he is too large*, but he has a quick way of solving that difficulty, by answering himself with a contrary apprehension, that more will blame him for not being larger, and so this objection is easily dispatched. As for the reason he gives of his *prolixity*, to wit, *because of the temper of the Quakers, who would have been ready to vaunt and triumph, if he had omitted any thing.* But for all this *boast*, it shall be shewn, that several times (as large as he is) he hath omitted whole considerable Paragraphs, where he found he would be pinched, and that the matter was too hot for his fingers, that he durst not meddle with it. At last he comes to an honest and ingenuous confession, *that in most of the heads, he hath adduced, for confirmation, only their Confession of Faith, and Catechism*: A very plain acknowledgment of the natur of his work, for he is very good at begging the question, and proceeding upon Principles denied by him he hath to do with. But the judicious Reader may judg whether his proofs be very valid and binding, which are only confirmed by that which is denied by me, and which needs to be confirmed no less than the arguments deduced from it: since I account it no confession of the true Faith, this is just as if a *Papist, arguing against a Protestant, should tell him he useth only, for confirmation, the decrees of the council of Trent*, how ridiculous this is any judicious man may judg. But since he hath so great a *veneration* of the *confession of Faith*, and also such an itch of scribbling, methinks he should not suffer it to lie so long under

under the censur of that *examen* which was written several years ago, and lieth yet (for ought ever I could learn) unanswered, all the notions of which albeit I will not espouse, yet I think all I. B.'s Clergy and Reason will not solidly reply to it, and I am wel assured it hath disgusted hundreds of that confession; (who are not *Quakers*) and also how weakly the *Confession* is confirmed, and how *grossly* the *Scripturs* are *perverted*, to make them serve it, I have given a tast in the last chapter of my book, intituled, *a Catechism and Confession of Faith*, which is not only extant in *English*, but he will find also printed in *Low Dutch*, and should in reason have been removed by him, ere he had used it only for *confirmation* in controversy against me. But there is something more in this expression, for, *when the Confession of Faith and Catechism is onely adduced for confirmation, what becomes of the Scripturs, that, in words, are so highly exalted?* It seems, notwithstanding all these verbal commendations, he has no more use for them than for an old *Almanack*, the *Confession of Faith and Catechism* is that which is to be minded. It seems what he brings of them in this controversy is only *pro formâ*, for the *confession of Faith* is only adduced for *confirmation*; it is the good *antidot* against the many *Errors* of the Times: and whereas he speaks of apposit passages of *Scriptur*, those, that will compare them with the things they are pointed to, to prove, will find in most not the least correspondence, of which I have given some proof in that place before mentioned.

¶ 6. But indeed he hath spoken out the truth of the matter, for all their great talk of the *Scriptur*, it is manifest to such as will narrowly look into it, that *not the Scriptur, but the confession of Faith and Catechism is their Rule of Faith and Manners*: for the *Scripturs* must serve the *Confession of Faith*, not the *Confession of Faith* answer the *Scripturs*, which must be turned, twin'd and *wrested*, to sute to the *Confession of Faith*. Hence if a man believe the *Scripturs* ever so firmly, and square his faith accordingly, unless he agree to every point of the *Confession of Faith*, all is to no purpose, he must pass for an *Heretik*.

At last, to conclude, he having, it seems, said all he has to say, makes provision not to be put upon the necessity to vindicat his *gross perversions* and *calumnys*. As for his comparison of *Rats and mice their dealing with books*, he must know I intend not to square these observations to gratify his humour, it will be enough for me to satisfy the candid and judicious Reader. He doubts not to make a judgment of things not yet in being, and



Sect. II. Of the true ground of Knowledge.

and therefore expects no answer, that shall savour of Reason, Religion, Candor and Plainness. We have seen that of him, which gives us ground to believe he has had enough thoughts of us: but however, he must not expect to be judge in his own cause, and whereas he saith, he *will not be troubled at our Railings and Barkings*, one may wonder the man has the confidence to accuse others of what himself is so highly guilty of; but he shall not need fear to be troubled with such stuff, and whether he gives or gets most of that, is referred to the judicious Readers, to whose judgment and censure, whether he will or not, as his writings will be liable, so to them, and to their Christian consideration, I freely submit what is written in these Observations.

Section II.

Wherein his two first Chapters, containing Remarks upon my Preface, and the first These of the true ground of knowledge, are considered.

**U**PON the Preface of my *Theses*, which is but about half a dozen of lines, he bestowes no less than 12 pages, all which being either bare assertions or railing (as can not escape the diligent Readers observation.) will therefore require the shorter reply. He hath not got the length of a dozen of lines, when with a piece of confidence he will seem so modest, as not to preoccupy the Reader's judgment, by calling the *Theses*, *Ethnical* or *Diabolical*, but methinks, if he has not forgotten his epistle, which we will in reason suppose the Reader to have first viewed, in which (as is above observed) there is enough of that sort said to preoccupy his judgment, so that he must needs put out his eyes, that doth not see that his pretended modesty and forbearance is not real.

¶ 2. Next, because these *Theses* are directed by me to Clergy men of all sorts in the Christian world, he will needs have it that I acknowledge a *Christian world*, to which my self and those I patronize do not belong: but how he makes this consequence appear he leaves us to divine, for there is no proof brought for it, but his own assertion. He needs not wonder that I acknowledge a *Christian world*, unless he had known me somewhere to deny it, for in respect of *Profession* (which distinction himself elsewhere useth) all these may be accounted of it, who make an outward profession.

cession of Christ, besides that I have sufficiently acknowledged my belief that in severals of them the inward life of Christianity is to be found; as for what followes, he needs not doubt, but I am as much against the distinction of *Lay* and *Clergy*, as himself can be. But since I writ to such, many whereof own it, my using it to them, for distinction's sake, will not infer my approving of it. With his usuall candor, he will have this direction to import no less than a *challenge to provoke all those, it is directed to, to a dispute*, as if a man for removing of mistakes and misrepresentations, could not give an account of his faith, without it be esteemed a provocation to dispute: if he really believes I intended so, I must tell him he is greatly mistaken, and I apprehend I should know my own intentions large as well as he. He is offended that our doctrines should be thought as different from Papists as Protestants, but with how little ground, will after appear; and he also refers it to a fitter probation. Then, after he has knocked as hard as he can upon me, for my confidence, he tells me, *that there is little said by me but what was refuted, ere I was born, by the orthodox writing against Pelagians, Socinians, Arminians, Enthusiasts, Anabaptists and Papists*. But methinks then there was the less need of troubling the world with his volum, yet he has for that a ready salvo, *he must answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit*. Some other reasons he adds for engaging in this his work, which the Reader may judge of, whether they be of any weight.

¶ 3. As he goes on, he is greatly offended I should stile my self a *servant of the Lord*, and will have it to be upon no better ground, than *Thomas Muncer and the Anabaptists of Munster*. But because all this is founded upon the supposition of my being a *false prophet*, and *preaching another gospel than the true*, we must leave it to the Reader's judgment, after he has taken time to consider of the whole debate. But, because he speaks here of the producing *credentials*, I would willingly have him producing his credentials for being a Minister of the Gospel, and it may be then seen, if I can not produce as valid, for any thing I stile my self, only he must remember, that, as his must have something more than his own affirmation, or those of his party, so he must overturn mine with some stronger arguments than meer *railing*.

¶ 4. He needs not apprehend, as he would insinuat, that *the omission of any words in the Theses prefixed to the Apology proceeds from my being ashamed of the name QUAKER*; since himself bears witness in the very same



## Sect. II. Of the true ground of Knowledge. 11

page, that I fully acknowledge it, in the explanation of the 11 Thesis. Here he has a descant upon *Trembling*, and seems to strange that any Quaker should bring the example of *Moses* and *Habbakkuk*, to shew that such a thing was not so much to be wondred at in the Saints: but why this should be esteemed impertinent by him he doth not tell us. As for the *foaming at the mouth*, he talks of, both here and elsewhere, it is returned upon him as a *calumny*, and he is desired to prove it; but it must be by some more credible & impartial testimony than his *Mr Statham*, for Partys use not to be admitted as witnesses. For his denominating us by that name of distinction, I shall not quarrel: but as for his insinuation in the beginning of pag. 5. where he saith, *It is like we would gladly have them casting away their Bibles, as no more to be regarded, than the Turks Alcoran*, it bespeaketh the height of malice, as to which I shall only say, The Lord forgive him for so gross a calumny, which he, that is the Searcher of hearts, knows to be a most horrible lye. He goes on after his usual manner, saying, *I inveigh against all humane learning, that hath been any ways made use of in Theology*; but where he finds this asserted by me I know not, whether the words he would deduce it from, to wit, (*that man has rendred the plain and naked Truth obscure and mysterious by his wisdom*) will bear such a consequence is left to the Readers judgment. But he thinks he has found out our secret design of being against *Learning* and *Schools of Learning*. (which is neither our affirmation nor principle, but his own *false supposition*.) *We would* (saith he) *have all those banished, that we might the more easily prevail with our errors*. But methinks the man should be more wary in venting his own *false imaginations*, unless he could bring some ground for them: for his assertion is so far untrue, that, if he had been rightly informed, he might have known that we have set up schools of Learning for teaching of the Languages and other needfull Arts and Sciences, and that we never denied its usefulness; only we denied it to be a qualification absolutely necessary for a Minister, in which case alone we have opposed its necessity.

¶ 5. He confesseth I speak not amiss, in saying, *the world is overburthened with books*, but thinks that my *Apology* of 50 sheets adds some considerable weight: but methinks he of all men should have here been silent, who has troubled the world with an examination of it a great deal larger; albeit he confesseth all, that is in it, hath been refuted by the Orthodox long ago, & not only so, but since that he has written a book near

twice as large upon one point, to prove the *first day of the week* to be the *Christian Sabbath*, and yet it is but the first time, and seems but to be the porch of what he intends upon that subject. With his usual candor he saith, *I am against disputes & debates, or books written of that natur*: But to infer simply that I am against all such, because I reprove the vain jangling that hath been and is among the *School-men*, is an ill consequence: he shall not find me any where speaking against usefull and solid controversys, for clearing and maintaining of Truth. He seemeth not to disapprove what I speak against *School-Divinity*, confessing the abuse of it, albeit he thinks it hath been of use: and as for this imagination of my being acquainted with it, we will place it among his other *mistakes*. He proceedeth pag. 8 to say, *I am against the labours of those that have writ commentaries*, but his conclusion here is like others of this nature. When I mention *commentaries*, it is with relation to what goes before, he will not deny but *many books are written under the notion of commentaries on the Scriptures, by which the Truth has been more darkened than cleared*; will it therefore follow that he condemns *Commentaries* indefinitely? As for such writings, tending to the opening of the *Scriptur*, in which the *Authors* are acted and influenced by the same Spirit, from which the *Scripturs* came, and which alone can give the true meaning of them, I am so far from condemning them, that I highly approve them, as very *beneficial* to the *Church of Christ*. As for his talk here of our disrespect to the *Scripturs*, I shall have occasion to take notice of it where they are particularly treated of: but he is apt to think, that the real ground of my prejudice against such books, is, because so much is to be found in them against my old errors; for I can not but know (saith he) that whoever reads these must see my nakedness and folly, without much study. As for this imagination we must take it with much more, upon trust; but this helps to prove the needlessness of his large Examination.

¶ 6. At his usual rate of Perverting he goes on to say, that the account I make of all the learned men of the World, is, that they are *Scribes and disputers of the World, &c.* But for proof of this we have nothing: he confesseth the words to be those of the *Apostle*, and how he proveth that I have a different meaning from the *Apostle*, I know not. After he hath commended his learned men, and loaded the *Quakers* with reproaches, he concludes this Paragraph, pag. 8. with another falshood, and yet he will have it remarked, to wit, that, according to my judgement, the pure and naked Truth

of

Sect. II. Of the true ground of Knowledge.

13

of God was never unfolded nor declared, untill the generation of the Quakers arose, but where he finds me saying so he tells not, and indeed can not, since such a thing was never asserted by me. For answer to my saying, that God has laid aside the wise and learned, and made use of illiterate men, as to letter-learning, after he saith, it is affirmed without proof, (not considering how improper it was not to expect any formal probation upon the occasion and manner it was delivered) he gives us divers citations out of the Apostle Paul, warning against seducers, all which I acknowledge to be true, but the question lieth in the right application; and yet since, (albeit he believes they very appositly agree to us) he thinks it not his present business to demonstrat it, it will need no reply. After he has proceeded in his 10 page, according to his usual sort of railing, affirming the great difference betwixt our doctrine and that of the Apostles, he brings forth a mighty charge, that I usurp the Throne of God, and judge of mens hearts and intentions: (but how guilty himself is of that crime, hath been in part already shewn, and will hereafter more appear.) but why do I so? because I say, the Clergy have clouded the Truth, that the common People might maintain and admire them? But have not Protestants, and that truly, asserted this of the Popish Clergy? and is not the Thesis directed to such? Will it not then hold true, according to his own judgment, of a great, yea the greatest part of those, to whom it is directed? what then will become of his clamors? Yea if it were needfull, I could give instances of very mean thoughts he and his Party have of many of the Protestant Clergy, byea and reflexions not much, if any thing, inferior to this, to verifie with how little ground he quarrelleth me here. As for his malicious aspersion, that there are shrewd presumptions our stock lies at Rome, he should have produced some of them, if he could; we could never yet obtain for this old calumny from our adversaries the least probation, and it will be found as hard for him to prove it, as he may think it for such, who strongly affirm their great IDOL, the COVENANT, was contrived at Rome, and came from thence. As for his reflexions upon our Church, as being all eyes and ears, it will be proper to speak of it in its own place. Next, to prove the positions of the Quakers to be such, as overturn and destroy the Gospel, he bringeth, pag. 11, divers citations out of Mr Norton and Mr Stalham, (as he terms them) adding more may be had out of Mr Hicks, but such witness will have small credit with impartial Readers. If he himself had dealt impartially, he should have first read our answers to them, ere he

14 Of the true ground of Knowledge. Sect. II.

had given them such authority. It wer easy for me, by way of reply, to transcribe what our Friends have written particularly by way of answer to them, did I as much affect to have my writings bully, as it seemes he doth. He closeth up this with a fit of *railing*, and, after he has quarrelled me, pag. 12. for having an high conceit (as he imagines) of my *Theses*, he falls fresh to that work again, telling, *they have weight to sink into the bottomless pit the poor Soul that embraces them.* I never sought any should receive doctrins, as truth, upon my bare testimony, and therefore he needs not upbraid me with so doing: and whereas, on the contrary, as himself immediatly observes, *I leave what I say to the LIGHT in every man's Conscience*, it shewes with how little reason he made his former alledgeance, after he has pleased himself with making an impertinent conjecture of the import of these words, that so he might, if he could, render them ridiculous, he cometh at last to the true understanding of them; and truly he needed not fear at my being offended that he should make a judgment of what I writ, according to his Conscience; but he went the wrong way to work, when his labour is to pervert and wrest, and make them speak what they do not. This apparently proceeds from malice and prejudice, and the Light of his Conscience, if he had minded it, would never have prompted him so to do. Thus I am come to the end of the first chapter.

¶ 7. In the second chapter, intituled, *Of the true ground of knowledge*, I find he can not contradict what is asserted by me. only, because he must be carping, he makes a noise that *Joh. 17:3.* cited by me, so much of the sentence was not set down in the first as second edition. What a pittifull *cavill* this is the Reader may easily judge, since the place was noted, it was enough, though never a word had been set down, but this with him is a bad *Omen*, let the judicious judge of this man's judgment in the matter. But, because he can not quarrel at what is said, he will quarrel that so much is not said as he judged meet: but he may be pleased to understand that I judged my self under no necessity to advise with him what was needfull for me to write. But (saith he) *since I take upon me to teach the whole world*, (it is strange it should be so natural for this man to write untruths, since I direct my *Theses* only to the Christian world: but if it may render me *odious*, such *Peccadillo's* pass with him it seems but for *Pia fraudes*) I intended never to write of those things, concerning which we do not differ from others. But let us see wherein he accounts me *defective*. I have  
written

## Sect. II. Of the true ground of Knowledge.

15

*written nothing* (saith he) *of the nature and attributes of God.* I write not to Atheists, but Christians, who already acknowledge, and I judg it not my work to write books to persuade men of that they already profess to believe. But I write not expressly and distinctly of the *Trinity*, yet himself after acknowledges, pag. 24, that it would seem I *am orthodox herein*, that he finds not any clear ground to the contrary. I write as expressly and distinctly of that, as is expressed in Scriptur, which I hope I. B. will not say is *defective* in sufficiently expressing this article of Faith.

¶ 8. The third challenge is, I *speake nothing of God's Decrees, by which some are predestinated to Life, others fore-ordained to death.* (for the man without ceremony takes the doctrine for granted) But if I have spoken nothing of this, (though perhaps not in the method he would) how extravagant must he be, that writes a whole chapter upon *Reprobation*, as pretending to refute what I have said concerning it. With the like confidence, not to say *impudence*, he accuses me of silence, in relation to the *Covenants*, to the *Redemption purchased by Christ, his taking flesh upon him*, to the *work of Grace and Sanctification*, to *obedience to the Law of God*. Which gross abuse any one that reads my book will easily see, considering how much, and how particularly these things are spoken to, in the explanation of the 5, 6, 7 & 8 *Theses*. Last of all, he accuseth me for giving no account of the *Resurrection of the Body*. But do I not expressly in my conclusion affirm, that those, that accuse us of denying of it, belye us? and doth not that clearly import an owning? But as to that matter (because I love not repetitions, as he doth, who will be upon one matter often, and out of its proper place) I will refer what further I have to say, untill I come to his last chapter. At last, after he has confessed in part to what I affirm, he craves *liberty*, because *some may put a wrong Foundation for the right to examine what by me is placed for it*: which liberty is freely granted him, (for I am a great enemy to *implicit Faith*, as wel the *Papish* as *Presbyterian*, who in that are much what alike) and I will take also liberty to re-examine his *examination*, that I may free my self of those many *abuses*, where-with he has injured me.

Section

## Section. III.

Wherein his third Chapter of *Inward and Immediat Revelations* is considered.

¶ 1. **T**Hat I may not trouble the Reader with a long and tedious pursuit of *I. B.* in all his *extravagant ramblings* and unreasonable *railings*, wherein he accuses me as an *Ignoramus, writing nonsense and confusion*, pag. 39. More of that kind in pag. 31. while yet, to his own confusion, pag. 40 & 41, he saith, he *knows not what I mean, nor what I would prove, nor what my arguments must conclude*: wherein if he speak true, he declares himself incapable to judge of, and far less to answer, my arguments, a large disquisition of his impertinency in which things I willingly omitt, and will consider this his chapter, as well where he misses, as where he truly in any measure urges the matter. And first to dispatch what is superfluous, all that is said by him against *false revelations and delusions of the Devil*, against which he speaks sometimes more largely, sometimes more overly, in pag. 21. 22. 34. 35. 36. 47. no judicious Reader will think is any thing to the purpose; since I never did plead for *False revelations*, but for the *necessity of the true Revelation of the Spirit to all real Christians*. And though it could be proved that either I, or any other Quaker, so called, were deluded by a false revelation, yet it will not thence follow, that our asserting the necessity of true revelation to the building up of true faith, is erroneous, more than, in *I. B.*'s own sense, the *Arminians* or *Socinians* asserting false doctrines, pretending to have for them the authority of Scriptur, will make him judge, that their asserting the Scriptur to be the onely and adequat rule of faith, is false, in his judgment, since he therein agrees with them. And therefore his *disingenuity* as well as weakness doth notably appear, pag. 46, 47, & 48. where coming to take notice of what I have said, in shewing how the same may be returned upon such as own the *Scriptur, Reason* and *Tradition* to be the Rule of their faith, he gives it no answer, and most affrontedly comes up with his oft reiterated story of *Iohn à Leyden* and *Munster*, (with which we are less concerned than himself) notwithstanding that I shew, that even men pretending to the Scriptur, and to be led by it, and in particular his own Brethren, had don no less vile actions, than those of *Munster*, and yet



Sect. III. Of inward and immediat Revelation. 17

yet he would not think it well argued to infer thence that it were dangerous to follow the Scriptur, as the Rule. To all this he returns no answer, which taketh up 6 pages in my *Apology*, Lat. ed. pag. 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31. unless it be a sufficient answer, to say *he needs not take notice of my trifling answers, and that it is a meer rapsody*. But the truth is, to use his own expression, *it was too hot for his fingers*; and therefore he judged best to shuffle it by so easily, but his unfairness in this is so much the more considerable, where the pinch of the question lay, and his own and his Brethrens reputation was so highly concerned, as being charged as guilty of no less abominations than the *Monsters of Munster*, in that he boasts, in his epistle to the Reader, that he hath examin'd every thing asserted by me, particularly, which he gives as the reason of troubling him with so prolix a Treatise.

¶ 2. Now albeit I might in reason pass his new inforced objection, till he have satisfied to this so shamefull an omission, yet lest he should fancy any strength in it, and to shew him the sillyness of it, I will here consider and remove it: it runnes thus, pag. 46.

*If since the Apostles and other extraordinary Officers fell asleep, and after the Arg. canon of the Scripturs was compleated, All that have pretended to immediat Revelation have been led by a spirit of Error, Then that is not the Way of Christ.*

*But the former is true:*

*Therefore so is the other.*

Such an objection is not like to signify much, where, in both Propositions the question is most miserably begged, and the thing in debate taken for granted: for, albeit the connexion of the Major should be granted, yet the question is there, in a great part of it, begged, to wit, that such Officers in the Church, as were the Apostles, are not now, neither as to the natur of their Office nor manner of their being led by the Spirit. Next, that *the canon of the Scripturs is compleated*, that is to say, No writings are ever hereafter to be expected or believed to be written by the Spirit, both which I deny, and he has not so much as offer'd to prove, and therefore his argument, if I should go no further, can conclude nothing. Next his Minor, to wit, that *all pretending to Immediat revelation have been led by a spirit of error*, is not at all proved by him, for albeit it might be said of all those old Scots, named by him, and of the German Enthusiasts, yet that is not sufficient proof, unless he can make it appear that there was never any other but were so also,

C

which

which yet remains for him to prove, and will trouble him to effect. For to affirm there were never any, because he has never heard nor read of them, were an argument a great deal more ridiculous, than rational. And for his challenging me to shew them, (albeit the instance of the Quakers be enough to spoil all his argument, as will after appear) yet by his good leave I am not bound, *Affirmanti incumbit probatio*, and that this answer is sufficient; I have the testimony of his learned Brother, *John Menzies*, Professor of Divinity at *Aberdeen*, in his book intituled *Papismus Lucifugus*, where he answers the Jesuit's *Minor* the same way, and proveth it to be sufficient. And surely he has not taken notice, that by this he has condemned, as led by a spirit of error, all the primitive Protestant Martyrs, that prophesied at any time, such as *John Hus* and *George Wishart* our Countrey-man, and many others, by reason of whose prophesying I. B. and his Brethren have valued their cause; since these Prophecys were said by them to proceed from *inward and immediat Revelation*, and so they pretended to it, albeit not as the ground of their faith and obedience in all matters of Doctrine and Worship, yet as the ground of that Faith, by which they believed these Revelations to proceed from God, and not from the Devil: and of that Obedience by which they published and declared these things. Moreover he overturns all, by the last instance, which he gives to prove it, to wit, that *the Quakers who pretend to immediat Revelations are led by a spirit of Error*: for proof of which we have only his bare affirmation, and yet, till this be proved, his objection is naught. For indeed this is a rare way of debating with an adversary, to make use of an argument by which he must be concluded already as erroneous, in order to convince him that he is such: if this be not, as they say, *to put the plough before the Oxen*, I know not what can be said to be so, for I. B.'s argument, to make it plain, amounts to this,

*If the Quakers be led by a spirit of error, Then the Quakers err, in affirming inward and immediat Revelation to be the ground and foundation of true faith:*

*But the Quakers are led by a spirit of Error:*

*Therefore, &c.*

Which is just as if I should argue thus:

*If I. B. be a Knave, a manifest Liar and Calumniator, Then he is not a true Minister of Christ, nor fit to write in Religious matters:*

*But I. B. is such:*

*Therefore, &c.*



### SECT. III. Of inward and immediat Revelation.

19

Is not this a notable way of arguing, and a quick way to dispatch controversies? What saith *Rob. Macquair*? Doth not this wel become his singularly acute, solidly learned, and truly gracious Author? Postscript pag. 559.

¶ 3. The next thing to be considered, is, his stating the controversy, where, according to his custom, he all along begs the question; for having writ down his opinion, and taken it for granted, without offering to prove it, he goes on and builds thereon without more difficulty, as if it were not to be further questioned: This appears in pag. 20. 28. 29. 30. 34. 35. 36. 37. 40. 43. 44. in which places he states his opinion of the *Immediat Revelation of the Spirit*, as not being such, as presents any Truths to be believed objectively, but only in removing the Vail of the Eye of the Understanding, and spiritually Illuminating the Mind, and Working effectually upon the Heart, to embrace and receive the Truth already revealed and proposed in the Scriptures. Now for not using this distinction and holding revelation in this his sense, he greatly blames me, as jumbling things together, and darkning and prejudging the Reader, and bestows upon me ever and anon many railing words, with the repetition of which I will not trouble the Reader. And yet notwithstanding this accusation, in contradiction of himself, he cites me pag. 42 & 28, taking notice of this very distinction, as used by some, and also refuting it. Surely the man must have miserably forgot himself, and will verifie the Proverb *Lyars should have good memories*. Next, since he judges I err, in not holding this manner of Revelation, and that he builds all his superstructur upon it, as the Truth; he should have offer'd to prove it to be such, for since he saith they willingly grant to these Scriptures noted by me, as many as are led by the Spirit of God, &c. Rom. 8: 9-14. together with 1 Joh. 2: 27. Joh. 6: 45. Joh. 14: 16, 17. By which Scriptures he can not deny but the manner of the Apostles being led, as well as of all Christians, is included, since some of them were directed to the Apostles particularly, in all which there is no ground for his distinction, and assertion: It is not said, *The Comforter, that I will send, shall lead you the Apostles immediately, by proposing Truth, to be believed objectively, to you, and this shall be accounted extraordinary, but, after you, it shall only lead other Christians by illuminating their Understandings, and that shall be the ordinary leading*. And since then it is a rule granted by all, that we must hold to the plain words of Scriptur, unless an urgent necessity force us to the contrary, he should shew us where this necessity lies; and prove his assertion to

be the true and genuin meaning of the words, and that we ought not to take them, as we do, according to their plain and naked signification and import. For I would willingly hear any ground from Scriptur of this nature, of *Extraordinary* and *Ordinary Revelations*, as pertinent to this debate; for albeit things *extraordinary* may be reveal'd to some, and not to others, that only respects the things revealed, not the manner of Revelation. For a man telling me extraordinary things, and ordinary, albeit the things may differ in their natur, yet neither my manner of hearing nor his of speaking do thence necessarily differ.

¶ But perhaps the man doth apprehend, that what he saith, pag. 20. 30. 31. 40. 44. 45. is some proof of his assertion, (which if he do, the Reader may easily observe his mistake) where he would insinuat, as if the manner of *Immediat Revelation* by the Spirit, asserted by me, rendered all other means, even those of Teaching and Exhorting, which are appoynted by God, useles, and took away all obligations of obeying the commands of God conveyed by others. And yet he taketh notice, pag. 23. that I acknowledge other means of Knowledge as profitable, neither has he ever heard me deny, but men are obliged to obey the commands of God through one another as well as in themselves, as the children of Israel were those of Moses and the Prophets, and the Christians those of Christ and his Apostles. But I suppose he will affirm with me, that no man's Obedience to any command will avail him any thing, unless upon inward belief and conviction that the thing commanded is of God, since *Whatsoever is not of Faith is sin.* If he say, that, albeit I do not deny such an obligation, yet it necessarily follows from my Principle. That this is untruely alleged will easily appear, since I suppose he will not deny but the rest of the Apostles, who were alive when Paul's Epistls were written were obliged to receive them, and obey them, as the dictats of the Spirit, yea and were benefited by them, and so the Apostle Paul by others: albeit on both sides he will acknowledge them to have had such revelations as he accounts *Immediat* and *Extraordinary*. And so we see that to have such revelations and yet to be *mediatly instructed* are not inconsistent, nor do they render one another useles, and indeed to affirm they do so is rather a presumptuous accusing of God, who has appoynted both in their order, for the edification of his Church, than a refusing of such as assert them. Such are his reasonings pag. 45. Besides that, this objection may be easily refuted, for since I. B. affirms, as particularly pag. 42. that the Scriptur is a compleat Rule in all things concerning Faith and manners in reser-

Sect. III. Of inward and immediat Revelation. 21

*rence to Salvation*, might it not be said that this takes away the use of all Commentaries and expositions, and other books, especially since he and his Brethren do with all affirm, that it is clear and intelligible to all, *in things essential to Salvation*, let him shew how this is weaker as to him, than the other as to me. With the like presumption he blasphemously asserteth, *that even these revelations*, which he himself calleth and acknowledgeth to be *inward, immediat and extraordinary*, *are uncertain, for this reason, because many men have been deluded by the Devil*: on which he also insists in the following page. And pag. 34. & 48. where he sums up his matter in this question, *How comes that others pretending to Revelation as much as I, have been deceived?* But as I said before, *How comes that others, pretending to be led by the Scriptur as the Rule as much as I. B. have been deceived, since the Scriptur declares nothing but Truth?* But how silly this is I have above shewn, and more largely in my Apology in those paragraphs, which I observed he most foully omitted. And indeed this is a fine argument he has provided for *Atheists and Sceptiks*, for it renders all Faith, even that of the *Patriarchs*, uncertain: for since the ground and warrant of their writing the Scripturs was, in his own account, *inward, immediat and extraordinary revelations*, and if such be, as he affirms, *uncertain*, then the truth of the Scripturs, which depends upon such, must necessarily be uncertain, since the stream can not be more pure than the fountain, nor the superstructur more sure than the foundation. And therefore most weak is his reasoning, pag. 46. where he pleadeth *that such Revelations can not be more sure than the Scripturs, which are the objective revelations of the Apostles written down*, since the certainty of these writings depends upon the certainty of these revelations, by which they were written, and certainly if in any case that maxim of the Schools do hold, it must in this, *Propter quod unumquodque est tale, illud ipsum est magis tale.*

¶ 5. It will not be amiss here in the third place to take notice of his most uncharitable and unchristian insinuations, contrary to all Christian and fair rules of debate, as first, pag. 24. where he will needs infer our denying of the *Trinity*, albeit he can not deny but he finds it owned by me, groundlessly coupling us with the *Socinians*: and to help him in this he brings-in the testimony of one *Mr Stalham*, as he terms him, an open Opposer of ours, which Witness to receive against us is most unjust. But I desire here in the entry that it be observed, that I intend to take little or no notice of his many citations, to prove what we hold, out of the

writings of our open Opposers, and shall give such a sufficient reason for my so doing, ere I make an end, as I am hopefull shall satisfie all judicious Readers, as wel of our innocency, as his injustice therein: but by this the man's temper may be seen, and that his design is not so much to refute what we truly hold, as to make the world believe that we hold what we doth not, to render us the more odious. And thus he proceedeth also basely to insinuat, *that I deny Jesus of Nazareth to be the Son of God*, albeit he doth not so much as pretend to any color for it from my words, only he finds *some Quakers give an indistinct answer in this matter*, but who they are or what their answer is he tels not: In pursuance of this, in the following page he insinuat, as if I mean'd not the first but the second *Creation*, and so joyned with *Socinus*, which is a gross calumny like the former; as also is what he saith, pag. 31. num. 18. where he raileth against me as writing things *contrary to the Scriptures*, and as *one, whose revelations are not from God, but from Satan*. For all this the only proof is, [1. B. saith so] which I must plainly tell him is with me of no weight at all. Of the same natur is what is asserted by him, pag. 33. nu. 20. wherein he insinuat, *that we condemn the Scriptures*, telling a lying story from his Author Mr Hicks of one *Nicolas Lucas*, which I desire him to prove the next time, not by Hicks, for he is accuser, but by some more indifferent Witnes, else to be justly held as a Calumniator. And whereas he saith, *We should not obtrude any thing upon them, without Scriptures*, this is another lying insinuation; for where do we obtrude any doctrines without offering to confirm them by Scriptur, as much as he and his Brethren? For if he say, *that our confirmations are not valid*, that is not to the purpose, we can easily say so of his, and do as truly believe it: but the question is, Whether we obtrude any doctrines upon any to be believed, telling them they ought to believe it, albeit we either will not or can not confirm them by the Scriptur? Now he knoweth in his Conscience this to be a lye, since I affirm of the *Scriptures*, Apol. Lat. ed. p. 47. & n. 60. that *they are the most fit outward judge of controversies*, of which himself also taketh notice in that place. And lastly, of the natur of these malicious insinuations is what he saith, pag. 48 & 49, and last paragraph of this chapter, where, after he has repeated what he terms my *monitory conclusion*, he infers, that *I mean, that a man should believe that Natur's dim light is the Spirit of God and the Holy Ghost, and that he may burn the Bible, and with confidence assert he is led by the Holy Ghost, whatever*

Scri-

*Scriptur or common sense say to the contrary.* This is all affirmed by him without the least proof, which as it is the height of injustice, so it is with respect not only to my words, but belief and intention, (God the Searcher of hearts knows) a most horrid falshood and calumny.

¶ 6. Now albeit what is said, may seem sufficient for a reply to this chapter, and is indeed enough to give any sober man a disgust of it; yet that he may not have reason to complain that any thing, wherein he may judge there is weight, and is directly to the purpofs, is omitted, I will now in the last place consider and answer what he saith against the *validity* of my *Arguments*, to which an answer hath not been included in what is already said. To begin then like himself, which to be sure is with some calumny or other, he saith pag. 14. *I stigmatize with the black mark of being carnal and natural Christians all, that assent not to what I say*: but he takes not time to prove it, and indeed can not, for, albeit I say that *it is like many natural and carnal Christians will condemn what I say*, yet it will not follow I account them all such who will not fully agree with me in this matter. Of the same kind is his calumny, p. 22. n. 5. where he allegeth the citations of the *Fathers* so called prove no more than his sense of *Revelation* above expressed, but whether he speaks true here or not the Reader may judge, by seriously reading over these citations, and then let him see if they do not hold out *an inward and immediat teaching of the Spirit of God in the Soul as the firm ground of Knowledge without which all outward teaching is in vain*: but to infer this, he tells *they writ against such as, being Impostors and led by the spirit of the Devil, pretended to Revelations*. What then? Can not men write against false revelations, without they deny the necessity of true ones? That is an odd conclusion. If *I. B.* were wel acquainted with the writings of the Quakers, (so called) he would find them as much against false Pretenders, as any other. But pag. 24 & 25 he findeth fault with my argument, deduced from these words, *that there is no knowledge of the Father but by the Son*, because I take notice, as a first instance, of *God's creating all things by Jesus Christ*, adding, *Was this so difficult a point to be proved, that I was constrained to go back to the first Creation for an argument?* Answ. No: but I judged it not improper (however he may) to shew first, as preparatory, God's more general way of working by his Son Jesus Christ, ere I come to that, which is more particular, and this was the reason as wel of my putting these *Propositions* into that order as of my using of that

24      Of inward and immediat Revelation.      Sect. III.  
 that instance, by which that pretended *abomination*, which he pretends  
*lurks under words*, vanisheth. For the man is very good at drawing in-  
 ferences from other mens words, which they, that spake and wrot them,  
 never thought of, as I for one can very wel witness, since the least can  
 be allowed me is to know my own thoughts and purpose, which how  
 he should come to assure himself he knows better than I, is more than I  
 can fathom. For the same reason above mentioned I used the instance  
 of *God's moving in his manifesting himself in his creatures, and of the Spirit*  
*of the Lord's moving upon the face of the waters*, which, pag. 26. he flouts  
 at, but doth not answer: and it is strange, that he, of all men, should be  
 offended with such preparatory considerations, where the matter is in a  
 few pages after closely come to, who has used so many remote arguments  
 and several not pages only but sheets, yea quires of paper, in order to  
 prove *the first day of the Week to be the Christian Sabbath*. He objects,  
 pag. 26. against my affirming that *God's communion with man was by*  
*immediat manifestation of the Spirit, from Adam to Moses*, because so  
 few are mentioned, and he supposeth the rest, not mentioned, had it only  
 by their instruction. But since these few, that are mentioned, are said to  
 have had immediat revelation, and that the rest had no written Rule  
 as I. B. will confess, it seems there was more of God's immediat re-  
 velation in those dark times, even by his confession, than now under the  
 Gospel, where the chief Pastors of the Church, according to him, are  
 to expect no such thing; neither is it proved that others, not mentioned,  
 had no immediat revelations, albeit they might have been instructed by  
 these Patriarchs, which I have shewn before to be very consistent. And  
 thus may be easily answered (setting-aside his railings) what he saith  
 pag. 27. against my urging the frequent revelations that men had during  
 all the time of the Law betwixt *Moses and Malachy*, (by which himself  
 confesseth the Scripturs of the Old and New Testament to have been  
 written) that that doth not prove that every one had such revelations.  
 What then? I lay not the stress of the proof of every one's having im-  
 mediately revelations upon this, but this is clearly proved from it, that  
 since immediat, inward and objective revelations were so frequent during  
 all the time of the Law, which was the less glorious administration, and that  
 of the Letter, it is grossly absurd to say, as I. B. and his Brethren do, that  
 they are now ceased under the Gospel, which is said to be more glorious, and  
 the pouring-forth of the Spirit more abundant and Universal, and that not  
 only



Sect. III. Of inward and immediat Revelation. 25

only for a little time, to wit, to the Apostles, with restriction to them and their times, (for which he never produc'd the least proof from Scriptur) but to the end of the world. And if so that *immediat Revelation* be not ceased, there is a great deal of the point gained, albeit *J. B.* confidently affirm that there can be proved nothing by these reasonings, but what no body will deny, since the *Divines of Westminster* have denyed, and *J. B.* no doubt with them will deny, that *immediat revelation* now is, since they positively say *that it is ceased*, and *James Durham*, whom *J. B.* applauds as a *reverend Brother*, and *Pastor of the Church*, hath most absurdly affirmed, in his *Treatise upon the Revelation*, that when *John finished that book*, *God spoke his last words to his Church*.

¶ 7. When he cometh, pag. 28. to my Proposition, asserting that *these revelations were of old the Formal Object of Faith*, he beginneth to inquire and conjectur what I mean by the *formal object*, and upon that he beltows the following page. For answering then his scruples in that matter, I say, In a *Divine revelation* two things are to be considered, 1. *the thing revealed*, and 2. *the revelation*: the thing revealed is indeed the *Material Object*, the revelation is the *Formal Object*; In which may be considered not only *the manner of the Revelation*, that is, the voyce, or speech of God unto the Soul, or his imprinting in the soul, by a Divine manifestation the things revealed, but also *God himself so operating*: both which, to wit, *Deus loquens*, id est, *God speaking*, is the *formal object of Faith*, He himself, his Veracity is the original ground of our Faith, his voyce, holy Influence and manifestation, by which he expresseth himself, gives us the certainty and assurance that it is *He*; and is very distinguishable, by those of a Spiritual discerning, from the most subtile appearance and transformations of the Devil, since Christ saith, *My sheep hear my voyce, and will not hear that of a stranger*: even as the voyce and appearance of two men of the most contrary and different humors, statures and complexions, are different and distinguishable by a man of sharp sight to whom those men are wel known; but of this I wrote more largely in my Letter to a certain Ambassadour, printed the last year at *Rotterdam*, at the end of the Letter written to the *Ambassadors of Nimwegen*, whereto I referr him for further satisfaction. But I wholly deny the consequence deduced by him, that, if *God's Veracity*, because it is God that speaketh and commandeth, be the *formal object of faith*, *Therefore it is all one, whether it be mediāt or immediāt*: since

D

albeit

albeit that be the original ground, yet the immediat revelation is necessary, that we may certainly know that it is *he*. For what avails it me to believe that all, that God commands, is true, and ought to be obeyed, if I do not certainly know the things I believe as truth do come from him? And the question is, Whether certain knowledge can be had without immediat revelation, and therefore to this his question, in the following page 30, *What was the formal object of the faith of the People to whom the Patriarchs and Prophets said [Thus saith the LORD] I answer, The inward Testimony of the Spirit in their heart, assuring them that the things spoken were from the Lord, and not the Divinations of the mens brains that spake them, and therefore inclining their hearts to receive and acknowledge these things as the commands of God unto them; since, as I. B. confesseth, they were not to believe them, because spoken by those men, but because of the Authority of God, it must be that; which wrought this perswasion and assurance in them, was the formal object of their faith, as the things spoken were the material: Even as the Light serves, by way of formal object, to make us see what is proposed unto us.*

¶ 8. Pag 31 & 32. he acknowledgeth that Divine and inward revelations need not be tried by the Scriptur as a more noble Rule, by him, who hath such a revelation, but by those to whom he delivers it; and then giveth the instance of the *Bereans* being commended: to which I shall willingly assent, judging no man, that delivers or declares a revelation to another, ought to be offended, that he try it by the Scriptur, which no true revelation can contradict. But that such may not also try it by the Testimony of the Spirit of God in their hearts I can not deny, and that it is the more noble Rule, as being most universal: since some Divine revelations, such as Prophecys of contingent truths, or things to come, can not be tried by the Scripturs, as was that of *George Wishart* concerning the *Cardinal's* death: for had another taken upon him at that time to prophesy the quite contrary, I would willingly be informed, by what Scriptur it could be deduced or known that the one was false, or the other true: yet who will be so absurd, as to deny but that it could, by the immediat Testimony of the Spirit? As for his proof that the Scriptur is the most certain Rule, taken from those words 2 Pet. 1: 19, 20. *We have also a more sure Word of Prophecy, &c.* it is but a begging of the question, in supposing that Peter by this understood the



Sect. III. Of inward and immediat Revelation. 27

the *Scriptur*, and indeed is most ridiculous to affirm. For since the Apostle reckons this *Word*, *more sure* than the voyce they heard with their outward ears, and the vision they saw with their outward eyes, it were absurd to affirm that the description or narration of a thing were more sure than the immediat seeing and hearing it. Can any description I may receive of *I. B.* however true, give me so certain a knowledge of him, as if I saw him and spake with him? Yet without any absurdity it may be said, that *the Inward Word or Testimony of the Spirit in the heart is more sure*, in things spiritual, than any thing that is objected to, or conveyed by the outward senses, as that vision was, of which the Apostle there speaks; since the inward and spiritual senses are the most proper and adequat means of conveying spiritual things to the Soul, by which the saints, after they have laid down this body, and have no more the use of the outward senses, which are seated in it, do most surely enjoy the blessed vision of God, and fellowship both with him and one another. As for that of Isa. 8: 20. *To the Law and to the testimony, &c.* and that of Joh. 5: 39. *Search the Scriptures, &c.* mentioned here by him, I shall have occasion to speak of them hereafter. It's true John tells *we are not to believe every spirit*, but it will not thence follow that the *Scriptur* is a more sure rule than the Spirit, for such a trial. Pag. 35. he thinks my saying, *that the Divine revelation moveth the understanding wel disposed*, confirmeth what he saith, and spoileth all my purpose, because then *every revelation pretending to be Divine is not to be submitted to*. But where did ever I say so? What he talks further of this *wel disposed intellectu*, pag. 36. I spake to, in my answer to *Arnoldus*, pag. 18, 19. to which I referr. For I believe *all men* in a day have, by the gracious visitation of God's Love, an *understanding wel disposed*, to some Divine revelations, which becomes disposed for others, as these are received; which will after in its place be discussed. And some Divine revelations, which are prophetick of things to come, may so far manifest themselves by their self-evidence even to men not regenerat, as to force an assent, as in the case of *Balaam*, mentioned by him, did appear. What he saith further, pag. 36 & 37. inquiring *how and after what manner these revelations were the object of the Saints faith of old*, is easily answered, by applying it to what is before mentioned in answer to his queries and conjecturs of the *formal object*. For those of old that had these revelations immediatly, the *formal object of their faith* was God manifesting him.

28 Of inward and immediat Revelation. Sect.III.

himself and his will *in* them, to them, by such revelations: and those, who received and obeyed the things delivered by the Patriarchs and Prophets, those things, so delivered, (as he confesseth) were not the *Formal*, but *Material Object of their Faith*, but the *Formal Object* was GOD, by the secret and inward Testimony of his Spirit, perswading them in their hearts that these things declared to them were really his command, and thence inclining and bowing their minds to an assent and obedience to them. And albeit pag. 38 he terms this a *wild assertion*, yet he hath but said and not proven it to be so, and till he prove; he needs no further refutation, neither is it non-sense nor yet a destroying of the cause, as with the like prooffeless confidence he affirms, p. 37 *that, where revelations are made by outward voices, or in a manner objected to the outward senses, the cause or motive of credibility is not so much because of what the outward senses perceive, as because of the inward testimony of the Spirit, assuring the Soul, that it is GOD so manifesting himself.* Which testimony, to answer his question, is distinguishable from what is objected to the outward senses, albeit it go always along with it *simul & semel*, as they use to say; since he with me accounts it a serious truth to say *the Devil may delude the external senses*, and he can far more easily deceive them, than the true inward and spiritual senses of the Soul, by counterfeiting the inward testimony of the Spirit, since by that, the Apostle saith, *we know and partake of that, which neither eye hath seen nor ear heard.*

¶ 9. Pag. 39. He confesseth with me, *that the formal Object of the Saints faith is always the same.* But yet, that he may say something, he spendeth the paragraph in railing, accusing me, *as writing non-sense*, and being an *Ignoramus*, because I bring instances which relate to the *material object*, which himself confesseth also to be the same in substance. But by his good leave, for all he is so positive in his judgment, I must shew the Reader his mistake: for those examples of *Abraham*, and others, are adduced by me, to shew the one-ness of the *formal object*, neither has he shewn that they are impertinent for that end, since as the *formal object of Abraham's Faith* was God's speaking to him by Divine revelations, so is the same the *Formal object of the Saints now*, and therein stands the unity or one-ness of our faith with him, and not in the *material object*, which often differs; for to offer up his son was a part of the *material object* of his Faith, which is none of ours now. And so for as much as he desires to know of me, *what was the material object of Adam's faith before the fall*, (a

que-

Sect III. Of inward and immediat Revelation. 29

question not to the purpose) he must first tell me, why he so magisterially and positively denys Christ to have been the *object* of his faith, and then he may have an answer And whereas he flouts at that reason, that *actions are specified from their objects*, as non-sensical, he should have proved and shewn wherein, and then I might have answer'd him: he might have wit enough to know, that no man of reason will be moved by his bare railing assertions, pag. 40. besides a deal of railing, wherein he accuseth me of *confusion* and *darkness*, he accounts my arguing for *immediat revelation*, from the revelations the *Patriarchs* and *Prophets* had, impertinent; to which I answered before: the sum of which is, that, since these immediat revelations were so frequent under the *Law*, it must be very absurd, to say, they are ceased under the *Gospel*. He himself proveth, pag. 41, that under the *New* there is a *more clear discovery*, according to that of Paul, 2 Cor. 3: 18. *But we all with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, &c.* which being brought by him, albeit against himself, I leave him to answer. In this page and the next, 42, he allegeth the *sayings of Christ and his Apostles*, brought by me, and my arguments thence, do prove no more than he confesseth: but whether they prove not all I plead for from thence, is left to the Readers judgment. Here, according to his custom, (though I condemn the *Socinians*) he will be insinuating, that I agree with them, to whose notions of the *Spirit*, albeit I assent not, yet I desire to know of him, in what Scriptur he finds these words, *that the Spirit is a distinct Person of the Trinity*; for I freely acknowledge, according to the Scriptur, that *the Spirit of God proceedeth from the Father and the Son, and is God*, and by what authority he seeks to obtrude, upon others, expressions of the chief articles of faith, not to be found in Scriptur, or to accuse such as will not accept of them, and assent to them, or whether any has reason to think he truly makes the Scriptur the Rule of his faith, (notwithstanding his pretence) when he either will not or can not find words in it to express the chief articles of his Creed.

¶ 10. Pag. 43. By a strange mistake he would have me prove, *that, since I make use of these promises of Christ relating to the Spirit, I would prove that all have warrant to write Scriptur*: as if no man could have immediat revelation, without he write Scriptur, whereas himself confesseth that many of the *Patriarchs* had it, before *Moses*, who yet wrot no Scriptur, yea and *Cain*, whom I suppose he judgeth to have been no writer of Scriptur.

ptur. And by the like mistake, pag. 45. he confesseth all I plead for, and contradicts all he has been fighting for, in affirming, *that Believers now have free access to Christ, the great Teacher of his People, always to get his mind known and writen in their hearts, but not to get prophetik revelations.* But where doth he find me plead for prophetik revelations as common to all? And whether the former words do not grant immediat objective revelation, in the largest sense I plead for it, I leave the Reader to judge. Here he accuses me of *speaking basely of the Scriptur*, but neither tells me where, nor what I say, which is indeed a base way of reviling, though familiar to him. To my last argument, pag. 49. § 35. he answers little, but railing. The minor [to wit, *that whereas Protestants call the Scriptures their Rule, yet, if asked why they believe them, do say, because in them is delivered the Will of God, which was revealed objectively and immediately to holy men*] he saith, *destroyeth the whole argument*, but why I know not; since surely that proves they at last recurr to the immediat testimony of the Spirit, as the certain and infallible ground of Faith, which is my conclusion. That I thence infer that Protestants are for the uncertainty of immediat objective revelation, is most falsly and disingenuously asserted by him, for I seek not to infer any such thing from the medium of that argument; but having shewn thereby how they are forc'd to recurr to this revelation, as the primary ground of their Faith, I add, that *it's strange then they should seek to represent that as dangerous, or uncertain, which they are thus forced to recurr to.* And whether he doth not so, ever and anon repeating the story of *Delusions*, to nauseating, through this chapter, any that reads it may see, and easily perceive his base disingenuity in that part: as also in the following lines, where he saith, *their concession makes nothing for the falsly pretended immediat and objective revelations which Quakers boast of*, for where doth he find me pleading for any such? Neither is it the question, *Whether the Quakers do falsly pretend to immediat revelation, yea or nay?* but, *Whether Quakers do wel, and are sound in believing that immediat Divine inward revelation is necessary to every Believer, for the building up of true faith?* But it is usual with him, where he can not answer, to turn-by the question, and fill-up the paper with railing and reviling!

## Section IV.

Wherein his Fourth Chapter *of the Scriptures* is considered.

¶ I. **W**E may judge of this chapter *of the Scriptures* by the first sentence, which contains a *lye*, saying, *he finds the third Thesis in somethings altered, and more clearly set down in the Apology, than in the single sheet*; whereas there is not one word of difference, but the misplacing of a word by the *Printer*: but it is become so familiar with him to speak *untruth*, that he can not forbear it! Indeed this whole chapter is a complex of *railing, calumnys and malicious groundless insinuations*: and indeed the man is so troubled, that he can not find any thing in what I write, (which he ought according to his title and undertaking only to examin and confute) that in stead of that he bestows several pages out of *Stalham* and *Hicks*, and his considerations upon them, whose lyes and calumnys are long ago answered, and unreplyed to by them. So that the Partys concerned having already vindicated themselves, it is not my place to medle in it; and if *I. B.* would do any thing in this to the purpose, he should take up this debate, where his friend *Mr Stalham* and his brother *Mr Hicks* the *Anabaptist* (whose authority he useth so often, and to whom he gives so much credit) have given it over, by a reply to these answers. Having solaced himself in the repetitions of these mens calumnys, (for that appears to be his delight) he digresseth to prove *the Scriptures to be the Word of God*. But if they be granted to be *the words of God*, which no Quaker, that ever I knew of, did or will deny, wherein are they derogated from? since they are many words, and not one. But if he will plead they are the *Word of God*, *καὶ ἡ ῥήμη*, or *per eminentiam*, to say so, seing *the Word of God* is ascribed to *Christ*, must either equal them with him, or speak non-sense, seing that one epithet can not be predicated of two things, *καὶ ἡ ῥήμη*, without a gross contradiction. That *the Word of the Lord* came to the *Prophets*, and that what they spake was the *words* that came from that *Word*, is granted, nor was it ever denyed by us, who are against all false revelations and lying fancies of mens imaginations, as much as he, which he here in this chapter repeats over and over again, to nauseating: but it  
will

will not thence follow, that the *Word*, spoken of by the Apostle, 2 *Pet.* 1: 19. is the *Scriptur*, which he has not yet proven, and I have shewn the contrary in the former Section

¶ 2. At last, pag. 54. n. 5. he comes to treat of the *Divine authority of the Scriptures*, and reckons it confusion and self-contradiction in me, to assert, *that the authority of the Scriptures doth not depend upon any efficacy or vertue placed in these writings, but is wholly to be ascribed to that Spirit from whence they came*; and yet, within half a dozen of lines, he confesseth the same, saying, *we stoop unto the authority of the Scriptures of Truth, because delivered by the Inspiration of God*, so the confusion and contradiction is his own. Yea the exampls he brings, of the *Acts and Statutes of Parliament*, do very wel prove what I say, for we do not submit to these statuts, because of the matter in them, or things commanded, but because of the *Authority* commanding: for when the Parliament by an Act appoynts a tax of so much money to be levyed from the Subjects, it is not the matter or substance of this Act, that makes us obey it, but because of the Magistrats Authority. But he saith, *they are Divine revelations, and therefore must have the stamp of Divine authority*. Answ. The stamp of Divine Authority lies not in the things revealed, but in the manner of the revelation, as being the voyce and manifestation of God; else great absurdity would follow, as I shall briefly shew, being to pursue him in this poynt, as he has it lying up and down in his rambling discourse, whose way is not to follow one matter to a period, but to touch it here and there, intermixing other things, that so his nauseating repetitions and oft reiterated *railings* may be the more covered. And therefore I intend not to tie my self to follow him page after page immediatly, lest I should embark my self in the like disorder, and make such a confused hodge-podge, as he has done; but to follow every matter as he has it scatter'd up and down. And of this I thought fit to acquaint the Reader in this place, once for all, as being the method I purpose to use, throughout this treatise. So from this 55 page we have him not upon this matter, untill page 61, where he takes notice of my citations out of several Protestant Confessions and Calvin, and will not have them to favour me, giving most disingenuously, as one reason, because they expressly say, *that the work of the Spirit is by and with the Word, and not an inspiration, distinct and separated from it*: thereby he would make his Reader believe, as if this were said by all of them, whereas it is only said by the *Westminster Divines*, of whom



whom I particularly observed, that they spake not so clearly as the other. The French confession saith, *it is by the inward perswasion of the Holy Spirit*: and the Belgik, that it is by the testimony of the Spirit in our hearts: and Calvin saith, *the Spirit of God must inwardly teach us that Moses and the Prophets spake from God*. But that testimony of the Spirit, which is in our hearts, and by which the Spirit teacheth us there, albeit it be not different from and contrary to the things it teacheth us of, yet it is certainly distinct and separat; albeit all the things taught were the very same, which here is not. Els, because a man may be taught that, by a Jesuit at Rome, which I. B. may teach another man in Holland, therefore that Jesuit and I. B. are not distinct and separat. Are these good reasonings? But let us now see whether these be any better, by which, in the two following pages, 62 & 63, he prosecutes the same matter, the sum whereof amounts to this, *that there are such evident characters of Divinity in the Scriptures, which do as manifestly prove them to be of God, as the Sun doth its shining, to a man whose eyes are opened: and that the work of the Spirit, is, only to take the veil from off mens eyes, that they may see these Characters of Divinity, and not that the Spirit, by any inward immediat revelation, doth signify to the Soul, by way of object, that these Books proceeded from the Dictates of the Spirit of God*: in which he places the difference betwixt himself and the Quakers. Now whether these aforesaid Testimonys of Calvin and the rest do not confirm this last, rather than the other, I leave the Reader to judge. But further, it's like the man has not been aware into what inextricable Difficulty he has run himself, by his reasoning here; for, if *this opening of the eyes by the Spirit be needful, to perceive these Divine Characters* (as the opening of the natural eyes is needful, to see the outward Sun) then the Characters can not be seen, but by those, whose eyes are thus opened, that is to say, who have *a wel disposed intellect*. And thus recurr upon himself all the difficultys and absurditys he would urge upon me, in his former chapter, for saying, that *Divine Revelations* are evident to a *wel disposed Intellect*. For it may be query'd Whether all have this *wel disposed Intellect*? their eyes thus opened? If yea, then all men have *subjective revelation*: yet at other times he accounts this a *privilege of the Saints*, and thence denies it, in confessing, pag. 63, that *some are blind, and see it not*; and then again the question recurs, How a man knows he has it, so that he may not think he sees it, and has it, when he has it not? This can not be decided by the *Scripturs*, for they are the matter under debate, and



\* The Examiners of the Westminster Confession.

† Some Lutherans.

that were to run in a Circle. And since, as he saith, the Devil is God's Ape, and that there are so many *Delusions* of the Devil and false *imaginations* of the phanſy which men are subject unto, as he has told over and over again; how is he sure that he is not thus deluded by the Devil, and abused by his phanſy, in imagining he seeth, when indeed he is blind? And to give him his own argument and query, since some and even \* Protestants have affirmed Books, denied by him, to be of the Canon, such as the *Wisdom of Solomon* and *Esdra's*, and to have these *Divine Characters*; and † others deny some to be of the Canon and to have these Characters, as the *Epistle of James*, which he saith has it, how is he sure that they are blind, and deceived, and not he? So that he must either confess all his former reasonings, as also here pag. 83: 86. to be to no purpose, or els acknowledge that all he saith here for the *Scripturs* is of no force, and that he has no better certainty nor ground for his faith of the *Scripturs* verity (to give him back his own dirty example he throws at me, p. 64.) than for the *Turks Alcoran*; and thus is dispatched also what he saith, p. 64. m. 18 where he confesseth, some approved Books, which others rejected. And whereas he saith, p. 86 & 87 that *sad Experience has taught the World, what devilish Doctrins have been invented under the Notions of New Revelations*, of which after he gives a list, since the same *sad Experience* has taught the World, what Devilish doctrines have been taught, under the notion of being revealed in the Scriptur, such as in his own account, those of the *Socinians*, *Arminians*, *Antinomians* and present *English Anabaptists*, to wit, his Author *Hicks* and his Brethren; and yet what will more follow from the one against the *Spirit of Revelations* now, than from the other against the *Scripturs*?

¶ 3. Like to this are his reasonings, Pag. 87 concerning the *Canon of the Scriptures*, that there are just so many Books, neither more nor less: for I have proposed this to be proved by Scriptur, it being an Article of their Faith, since they judge all such should be proved by Scriptur. To this, in stead of offering any Scriptur-proof, he saith *they have the Characters of Divine Light*, the weakness of which is above observed; & then he brings two Examples, one of the *Acts of Parliament*, another of a *man's writing ten letters to his wife*. But examples are poor arguments, especially to prove Articles of Faith, when not one Scriptur can be brought to do it by such as say *the Scriptur is the adequate and only Rule of their Faith*; neither will his examples do. For if in a Nation one Part should differ from the other, alledging

ſpu-

spurious Acts, not made by the Parliament, were by the industry of some, printed and recorded with the right, as the case is now among the Professors of Christianity, concerning the Canon of Scriptur, the written Acts could never decide this question, but either these Legislators, if alive, or a new Parliament having equal Authority and Legislative power with those that made the former. And if a Woman should doubt that five of the ten Letters, subscribed with her Husband's Name, were not his, she could not know the certainty, but by her Husband's own Testimony, and since he himself has said, that, to discern these Characters, a subjective concurrence of the Spirit is necessary, which since he saith some have not, they can then not be sure of this Article of Faith: his Example here of the five Fingers is yet more silly than the former. And albeit he confidently affirms he has above shewn this, we shall by examining it shew the contrary, as p. 74 & 75. answering to that of mine, where I shew that in *Prov. 30: 5, 6.* there is the same Prohibition of not adding, that is *Rev. 22: v. 18.* and therefore it would follow, that all written after Solomon's time was against the mind of God. To this he gives a rare answer! *what is spoken of that Book* (I suppose he means the Revelations) *and elsewhere of the Commands of God, is consequently to be understood of all;* but this is to repeat that against which the argument is formed, in stead of answering it. Either that of Revelations must not be understood as he doth it, or that of Proverbs makes the same exclusion, since the words are the same, and the Authority also. But the Prophecys of the Prophets (saith he) were but Explications of the Law of God: but such Explications go to make up the Canon, and will he admit that yet? No. But the Lord did not (saith he) bind up his own hand; but has he bound up his hands now, that he can not move any of his Servants by his Spirit to write? I suppose he will not say he hath. He confesseth there were Prophets after John's days, who truly fore-told Events, but were not to write Scriptur. But is not a part of that, which he accounts the Canon, a fore-telling of Events? and yet that excludes it not from the Canon. Here, because he is pinched, he takes his usual retreat by falling a railing, and comparing us with Papists, who he saith use this Argument. And what then? I could tell him an hundred arguments, used by him, which the Papists also use against us, will he say it follows, they are invalid? But at last he thinks he has found a mysterious Riddle, that will do the business, and therefore he leaves it with a defiance, *Let him un-riddle this*

*mystery, if he can, to wit, when shall our Canon be compleated? when will there be no more need of Revelations?* But might not this same question have been proposed to the Christians that lived before John wrot his Book of the Revelation? And, as I suppose they would have answered, (to many of whom perhaps it was not revealed that John should write such a Book afterwards) so shall I directly answer his question, When it shall please God, in whose Power it is to reveal himself, when, how, and so long as he pleases, and *who (as he saith) has not bound up his own hand.*

¶ 4. I come now to consider what he saith of *the perfection of the Scriptures*: and because he is very clamorous in accusing me, as derogating therefrom, it will be manifest whether he has any reason so to do. P. 55. n. 6. he quarrels I forget the narration of the first Creation, and that the Examples are instructive. But who will deny, or when did I, that the remarkable Providences of God towards his Children are instructive? Do not I expressly shew how they are instructive, p. 46. which himself also noticeth? And was the first Creation no part of God's Providence towards Man, who was to rule over it? Is it not then there included? But I make no mention of the promises and threatnings: but are not they any part of the Doctrins of Christ, nor included in any part of these pretious Declarations, which I say the Scriptur contains? Next, he carps at my saying [the Chief Doctrins of Christianity] asking *where we may find the whole Doctrins of the Christian Faith?* I answer freely, in the Scriptures: and let him prove, if he can, this to be any contradiction, seeing my saying [the Chief Doctrins of Christianity] is indefinit, excluding none. And therefore most base and abominable is that lye he makes of me in the last part of this paragraph, where he saith, *I say the Scriptur only beareth Testimony to some of them, to wit, of the Chief Heads of Christianity*, which I dare him to prove ever to have been said or written by me. And of the like nature are his lying conjecturs and his malicious insinuations from my words, in the two following paragraphs, which I utterly renounce and return upon him as his own false and fictitious apprehensions: for do not I declare the Authority of the Scriptur, when I testifie they are from the Spirit; and that such commands require obedience, as has been above shewn? But what he urgeth of this further, p. 57 & 59, from the saying of some Quakers, affirming *that is not a Command to them; which is given to another*, albeit I might justly reject it as impertinent, till he prove it, for the reasons upon this occasion above declared; yet, because he mentions

Benja-

*Benjamin Furlly* in *Rotterdam* having some knowledge of that matter, I answer, Whether will he say all the Commands in *Scriptur* to every person, there mentioned, are binding upon every individual now? If he dare not say they are, as I know he dare not, how must I then distinguish betwixt what binds me and binds me not? Must it not be by the Spirit (suppose it were only *subjectively*, as he will confess) inlightening the Understanding? To make this distinction then, it seems it is the operation of the Spirit that makes them know their duty, and sure they can not obey before they know. But, if he say that though they should want that operation of the Spirit, & did not know nor acknowledge them to be their duty, yet they are binding upon them: neither *B. F.* nor any *Quaker* will deny but even the Commands of God's Spirit & the Precepts of the *Scriptur*, which now concern all, are binding upon all, so that they shall be justly condemned for not obeying, albeit that by the perverseness of their hearts and wills they either refuse to obey, or will not acknowledge them. So that his urging of that, p. 60 & 61. n. 13. and his pleading for it, is unnecessary, and needs no answer: yet who would say, they could obey, to any advantage of their Souls, without this operation of the Spirit, since *whatsoever is not of Faith is sin*? But as to these words said to be written by *B. F.* he is here challenged to prove they are his, without adding or diminishing, (and it's well known the adding or diminishing of two or three words in a few lines will quite alter the sense) and before he has answered this challenge, and free'd himself from the just censure of a *Calumniator*, albeit he take the help of his Author *Hicks*, he will find his folly, in accusing men at second hand, *proofs*, and upon the testimony of their adversaries. What follows in this paragraph and p. 60. is meer railing and perversions, comparing us with *Papists*, as is before observed; and indeed all of it is overturned by that one assertion of mine, that *what revelations are contrary to the Scriptur are to be rejected*.

¶ 5. Pag. 57. n. 10. he saith, *I come nearer to the core of my designe, which is to set up Enthusiasms*, in affirming that the *Scripturs* are not the *Fountain*; but a declaration of the *Fountain*: and yet the man within 3 or 4 lines confesseth it himself, ascribing it to my folly to dream any man thinks so, (thus he goes backward and forward!) which he illustrates by the example of *Laws*. But if it be so, are not they to be blam'd that account them the principal Original of all Truth and knowledge? Whether the other branch of my deduction follow from this, that they are not to be accounted the pri-

*mary Rule of Faith and manners*, will appear, when the arguments and objections, relating to that, come particularly to be mentioned. And whereas he thinks this is absurd, and not making for my designe, because *God himself is the Fountain, and yet not the Rule*, he mistakes the matter as urged by me; for I argue that the Scriptures are not the original ground of knowledge, but GOD, not *simply* considered, but as *manifesting* himself in Divine immediat revelations in the hearts of his Children: which being the New Covenant's dispensation, as in the last *section* is proven, is *the primary and adequat Rule of Christians*. For I was never so absurd as to call God, *simply* considered, or *the Spirit of God* [ *in abstracto* ] ( not as imprinting Truths to be believed and obeyed in mens hearts, not contrary but according to Scriptur, for he can not contradict himself ) *the Rule of Christians*: and this may serve to answer all his *cavills* upon this Theam. And whereas he wondereth in the following page 58. *why any revelations even from the Spirit should be more primary than the Scriptures, since they are confessed to come from the inspiration of the Spirit*, ( for why he useth the Latine word *afflatus*, and doth not interpret it, I know not, unless to fright ignorant folk, that they may think it's a piece of the witch-craft of the Quakers whom he accuseth ) it is strange he should have so little sense; as to make it a matter of admiration, as if that were not more *primary* to a man which cometh immediatly from the Spirit of God in his heart, than that which ( albeit it come from the Spirit ) yet is through another, and so must needs be but *secondary*, albeit it be confessed they writ them not for themselves, but for others, which I deny not. Of the same natur is, and the same way is answered, what he saith, p. 65. n. 19. to wit, *that I confound the Principal Leader with the Original Rule, because I say the Spirit is the Prime and Principal Leader*: but I deny his consequence, neither doth his example of the *Wind and Compass* prove it; the Spirit is the Principal Leader, as imprinting upon man's Soul the Rules he should walk by: but indeed he would prove a very uncertain *Pilot* that had no *compass* but only a description of it, and a journal how other men had steered that course, and such *Pilots* is he and his Brethren, according to their own confession. But he thinks I drive at something more *intolerable*, to wit, *that the Revelations the Quakers pretend to, or the Light within, is to be preferred, as the more primary and principal Rule, to the Scriptures*: If the Quakers did affirm any revelations, they speak of, as coming from that *Light*, either were or could be contrary to the Scriptures, he would say something, other-

otherwise it will amount to no more but that *commands*, as they are imprinted upon the Soul, that is, *the Law written in the heart by the Spirit*, is more primarily and principally the Rule than the same things written and received only from another; as to which I will only ask him, Whether those things, which the Apostles received immediatly from the Spirit commanding them to go here or there to preach the Gospel, or the like, were, as to these ends, more primarily and principally the Rule to them, than any thing that was recorded in the Scriptur, where they could not learn their duty, as to those particulars? And that I make not the Scripturs and the Spirit all one, I have above shewn; and therefore his malicious insinuations of *Socinianisme* fall to the ground: but he thinks he has found-out a mighty dilemma in the end of this paragraph, p. 66. *Or will I say that the Light within me is really the Increased Spirit? This (saith he) must be blasphemy with a witness--- to be heard with horror, and therefore needing no other confutation.* Poor man! how apt is he to make a noise about nothing? If there be any blasphemy, it is his own. For what if I should say *Is not GOD a LIGHT? and is not he in every man? and is not this Light within the Increased Spirit?* The Reader may judge how easily these windy boasts of his are blown away: how the Spirit ruleth us and yet is not confounded with the Rule, I have above shewn, so that what he saith to that in the rest of this page, where he *vapers* and *tails*, is but superfluous. Next, after he has a little plaid the Pedant upon the words *magis originaliter*, he concludes his 22 paragraph, with asking me, *why the revelations I pretend to should be accounted more One with the Spirit himself, than these revelations by which the Scripturs were dictated?* but this is his allegiance, none of my affirmation. Next, I never said that the Revelations, by which the Scripturs were dictat, were *less primary* than any other whatsoever, albeit no revelation, which is written and transmitted to a man only by the report of another, can be so primary and immediat to him as that which he receives in himself: he confesseth here with me, p. 67. *that the Spirit is the Prime and Principal Leader*; whether that makes for my cause, as also what follows, will after in its place be examined.

¶ 6. But because he foundeth his assertion of my detracting from the perfection of the Scripturs, because I deny them to be the *primary* and *original Rule*, (for he acknowledgeth that I confess them to be a *secondary* one) I will examin the ground by which he goes about to prove it, as also his answers to my arguments proving the contrary. His *first* is from the *parable*,



parable, Luke 16: 31. where it is said, *They have Moses and the Prophets, n. h. m. if they hear not, neither will they be persuaded, if one be raised from the dead*: but this proves only that one raised from the dead is not able to convince those that will not hear *Moses and the Prophets*, not that the *Scriptur* is a more *primary and principal Rule* than what the Spirit immediately reveals in the Soul; for that consequence will not nor doth follow, nor is in the least proven by him, neither can be, unless he first prove, that, albeit the testimony of one from the dead be less powerfull to persuade than the *Scripturs*, yet it is more than the immediat testimony of the Spirit in the heart, which I deny, and rests for him to prove, before he conclude any thing from this place. Next, this Parable was used by Christ to the Jews, to shew them their *hypocrisy*, who, albeit they deceitfully pretended so much to reverence and follow *Moses and the Prophets*, (as many now adays do the *Scripturs*) yet they did not really hear them, els they would have acknowledged *him*, of whom *Moses and the Prophets* did so clearly write, since he also did as great and convincing miracles before them, as if they had the testimony of one raised from the dead. And this leads me to take notice of what he saith, p 68. n. 24. in answer to my argument drawn from the difference betwixt the *Law* that is *written without* and the *Gospel* that is *written within*; where he accuseth me of *contradiction*, because of my argument drawn from the revelations that were under the *Law* and the *same-ness* of the *object*: but I have answered this *cavill*, in the former section. Yet since the strength of this resolves in his supposing I affirm *there is no written Rule under the Gospel*, which he after concludes, the whole falleth to the ground; for I never denied the *Scriptur* to be a *secondary Rule*, and that is *some Rule*, for to say I affirm *there is no written Rule*, because the *written* is *not the primary*, is a wild conclusion. And therefore all the rest of his talk to prove that Christ inspired the Apostles to write things to be a *Rule* to Christians, is meerly superfluous, since that that is a *Rule*, though not the *primary*, was never denied by me: and it may be here observed, that all his arguments to prove the *Scriptur* to be a *Rule*, unless they prove them to be the *primary and principal* one, conclude nothing, and are against me to no purpose.

¶ 7. His second argument is deduc'd from 2 Tim. 3: 16. where he cites the Apostle saying of the *Scripturs*, *they are able to make wise unto Salvation, and to make the man of God perfect*. Where is first to be observed, his perverting of the Apostl's words, by an addition of his own, (and there-



therefore no wonder that he so frequently pervert mine) for the Apostle saith not, *they are able to make the man of God perfect*, but, *All Scriptur given by inspiration is that the man of God may be perfect*, that is, contributeth in its kind and order towards the perfection of the Saints; but it follows not thence, that they are the *Primary Rule*, no more than though I. B. will affirm that his book is written, *that the man of God may be perfect*, that is, to help him to perfection, that thence it is to be esteemed the *primary* and *chief Rule*. Thus is answered that of *John 20: 31. But these are written, that ye may believe, &c.* cited by him, p. 74.. For his book is also written for that end, yet the consequence will not follow: that *they are able to make wise unto Salvation* is not denied, in so far as they declare of the *grace that brings Salvation* and directs to the *Light* which leads to it; but how he thence inferreth they are the *primary Rule*, he must inform us the next time, since he has forgotten to do it now. And this may serve to answer those places, where he (according to his custom) repeats it over and over again, as p. 74. 77 & 82. where he hath again the fore-mentioned perversion, and enumerated the particular uses, applied to the Scriptur, he concludeth its perfection, as wanting nothing. Now I deny not that every book as well as chapter and verse of Scriptur is perfect as to its end, that is, so far to express the mind of God, as he was pleased at that time, and also with a respect to its Author, as being written by the dictates of the Spirit: but that place will not conclude its perfection, either as the *primary only* or *adequat*, that is, *entire, Rule*, els all the other Scriptures, which were written after that Epistle of Paul, (as he will not deny but there were some so written) must be denied being any part of the Rule, & so to be any way necessary for that end. The like absurditys follow upon his using *2 Cor. 3: 14.* where the Apostle speaks of a *Testament*; since he dare not deny a great part of that *Testament* was written afterwards. And thus is also answered what he urges from *Psal. 19: 7. (pag. 74 & 79) The Law of the Lord is perfect, &c.* and from other Scriptures of like import: for if he understand *perfection* in the first sense, it is not denied; if in the second, which indeed is the question, it concludeth nothing, without rendring all the Scriptur, written afterwards, no part of the *Rule* or *Canon*, to use his own term. As for that of *Peter*, which he insists upon, in the end of his paragraph, p. 70. I deny it to be understood of the *Scriptur*, and gave my reasons before; and yet the man takes that for granted, and thence argues from it, which is a most silly manner, albeit very familiar to him, to beg the question.

¶ 8. Next, he comes to consider my answer to their objections, but how he removes them may be judged by the first he observs, p. 71. where, in stead of proving that these words of Isa 8: 20. usually brought by them, *To the Law and to the Testimony, &c.* are meant of the *Scriptur*, which I desired, ere any thing could be inferred for it, he answers, *As if any, that ever read the Bible, could be ignorant, what is all along meant by these words.* Is not this a goodly proof, Reader? I am one that have read the Bible, and know by the [*Law*] is sometimes meant the *outward*, sometimes the *inward*, and thousands more are yet to be convinced, that that place speaks only of the *outward*, and will need some better argument than this of his, ere we change our judgment. But to proceed, he thinks my saying that *the Law was in a more special manner given to the Jewes, and more principally than to us, to be a railing and roaving, and a contradicting what I said in the former These:* but this cavill, often repeated before, I did answer above. The like he judgeth my arguing therefrom, that *as they were to try all things by the outward Law, so we are to try all in the first place by the Word within:* but here his base disingenuity appears, for he has left-out these words [*in the first place*] that he might introduce the better the difficulty he phancyeth to himself to have brought me to afterwards; for by this argument (saith he) *I prove more than I ought, to wit, that the Scriptures shall not be so much as a less principal Rule.* Who will be so foolish as to conclude that the saying *things ought* [*in the first place*] to be tried by the *Word within*, excludes things [*in the second place*] to be tried by the *Scripturs*? and is not that still to own it as a *secondary* and *subordinat Rule*? And so he may see my feet here are easily rid, and that he held them not so fast as he phancyed. And as for the other part of his alternative, the consequence is of the like natur, that *what was a principal Rule then is now only subordinat*: for albeit I said it was more principal to them than now to us, yet I said not it was the most principal to them, or then more principal than what came immediatly from the Spirit, which he confesseth to have been frequent under the *Law*, yea more frequent than now, according to his Principle, and my saying so could only infer that consequence. He rejects what I urge from the version of the *Septuagint* as *spurious*, but for that we must take his word, els want a proof. And then because he can not come off better, according to his custom, he concludes with a gross perversion and falshood, saying, *it is my opinion, that the Law, id est, the outward Law, was given the Jewes for a Rule,*

*Rule, even above the Spirit's revelations*: which if it be mine, (as I utterly renounce it) I desire to know where I have asserted it; he might have been at the pains to mark it, but he knew, it's like, it was not convenient. Next, he comes to prove, that these words *Search the Scriptures, &c.* *Joh. 5: 39.* do evince the *Scripturs* to be the *primary and adequate Rule*, because if Christ's doctrines should be tried by them, much more private *Enthusiasms*: but who denies that? Yet he doth not thence prove, that the *Scripturs are the primary Rule*, by which all things must be tried *in the first place*, which is the thing in question. Secondly, I would ask him, Whether the words Christ spake to the Jewes, which are recorded in *Scriptur*, were less a Rule to them, or less binding and obliging upon them, than the sayings of *Moses* and the *Prophets*? If he say they were less, then he overturns all his own tedious reasonings, by which he labours to prove the obligation of what Christ and the Apostles delivered, (p. 84. at the end) as well as what *Moses* and the *Prophets*, without the need of a new obligation: and likewise he must shew us how these sayings come to be as binding upon us now, as *Moses* and the *Prophets*, or how they acquired greater authority, after Christ spake them, than they had then, or why they wanted then that authority. If he say, they were binding and obliging to the Jewes, because spoken by Christ, then his proof falleth to the ground. He is angry that I say the words may be interpreted, *Ye search the Scriptures*, as well as *Search the Scriptures*, albeit the Greek word signify the one as well as the other, and for answer, very magisterially tells it is quite contrary to the very words of Command, *Search the Scriptures*; but the question is whether that be the words, and that was what he should have proven: but he makes no bounds of begging the question, telling, *Tolet* and *Maldonat* say it is so taken by all the *Fathers*, except *Cyrril*. And what then? Did I undertake to subscribe to all these Authors writings? He must give me a reason why, ere I do it, and let him deny it, if he dare, that the Greek word signifies *Ye search the Scriptures*, as well as *Search the Scriptures*; and if it do, before I conclude the one more than the other, I must have some better argument than his bare affirmation. But to finish this, he will conclude all by the words of the Apostle *James*, c. 1: v. 25. where he saith the Apostle calleth the *Scripturs* the perfect Law of Liberty, but that doth not prove them to be the *primary Rule*. Suppose it were granted the Apostle meant the *Scripturs*, which remains yet by him to be proven, and is not done by what he

citeth chap. 2:8. by his desiring them to fulfill the Royal Law, according to Scripture, *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thy self*, which proves it not at all; yea to understand it of the Scriptures were to make the Apostle's words scarce good sense, as if he had said *fulfill the Scriptures according to the Scriptures*, whereas it sutes the place much better, that the Apostle meant they should fulfill the Royal Law in their hearts, which was one with the Scriptures, that also command the same thing: that the Apostle means the outward Law, and not that written in the heart, chap. 4:12. he hath affirmed, but not proven. Next, he comes to the Bereans being commended for *searching the Scriptures*, Act. 17:11. But this is the same way answered as the former, for if the Bereans were obliged to believe and receive Paul's testimony, because he preached the Truth to them, by authority from God, then their using or his commending them for using the Scripture will not prove the Scripture to be the Primary Rule, yea more a Rule than the doctrine they tried by it. In the rest of what he saith in this n. 28. he but fights with his shadow, for I never said they excluded the Law of Natur, in affirming the Scripture to be the Rule; or did I ever deny but that the Scripture reveals things which Natur could never have discovered? But the question is, whether that truth, that Man is the Offspring of God, from which the Apostle argues with the Athenians, was discovered to any by meer Natur, or by a Divine Principle? and this is that he should have proven, and therefore yet remains for him to do; but to be like himself, he concludes this also with a gross lye, saying, I affirm the Scripture to be no more our Rule, than the Heathen Poets, which no ways follows from my words, neither hath or can he ever prove it.

¶ 9. He thinks the Scriptures not determining of many things, nor having any Rule for them, which he seems to acknowledge, is no argument against their being the primary and adequate or only Rule, for that he apprehends no rational man will think needfull to a complete Rule. Why? because general Rules are enough, and thence he thinks it would follow, that the Quakers must have a new particular revelation for every act and word, such as eating, drinking, walking, &c. But I deny this consequence: these acts, as simply considered, are natural; and it will not follow, because to spiritual acts, relating to Faith and my immediat service towards God, I need a spiritual motion and influence of the Spirit, that therefore I need such a thing to natural acts. If he say these natural acts, under some circumstances, may be sin, or duty; I confess then the revelation of

of the Spirit is needfull: for if I be *sitting, sleeping, or eating in one place*, when it is the mind of God I should be *preaching and praying in another*, I do sin: but how can the *Scriptur* give me a *Rule* here? All that he answers to this, p. 76 & 77. resolves into this, *that all such doubts may be solved applying the general rules of Scriptur, by Christian Wisdom, Prudence and Discretion, &c.* But how shall I know that I truly make this application? And to give him his own often repeated argument in the case of *Revelation*, have not some thought they have made this application by Christian prudence, when they did not? And not to go further than I. B.'s own Brethren, the *Presbyterians*, yea the chief and most eminent Teachers among them, did not some of them judge it Christian prudence, according to the *Scriptur Rule*, to draw near & adhere to the *Remonstrance* which others called *publik Resoluzion* men, denied? Do not some of them think it Christian prudence, to go hear the *Bishops Curats*, which others deny? Did not those chief men among them, as *George Hutcheson* and others, think it Christian prudence, to accept of the *Indulgence*, Anno 1668, in entering according to the limitations proposed by the *Council* to their Places, which others, especially of the *banished Brethren*, and perhaps himself was highly offended at? whence these men were termed *Council-Curats*. Other instances among them I could give. But how shall all this be decided? What *Scriptur-Rules* can he assign, that clearly do it? Let him answer this distinctly, and not pass it over, lest he be suspected to leap, where he can not step. He confesseth to my alledging *1 Cor. 12. & Rom. 12.* and after a little railing, he tels, p. 78. *that he that is to rule is to do it with diligence, &c.* but that the *Scriptur* saith not that *James or Peter should take-on this or that Office*, by which confession he destroys all, since the question is, How *James and Peter* knew they should take upon them to rule? This he saith he has shewn above, but how insufficiently my reply will evidence. He thinks no less impertinent, p. 78. for me to argue against their being a *Rule* as to all things, because they do not tell a man *that he has the marks of true Faith*, upon which knowledge the assurance of Salvation is founded; as if I must think the *Laws of the Land* must prove that *R. B.* is a *Quaker*, or that if *R. B.* had murder'd a man, it is a sufficient defence to say the *Law* doth not name *R. B.* But such examples are poor arguments, and do miserably halt: *R. B.* confessing himself to be a *Quaker*, acknowledging every one of their doctrines, is enough to prove him one, in the sense of the *Law of the Land*, and the

Judge is to condemn him a murderer, if convict by Witnesses that he really did the deed. And both these relate to outward things, which can be proven by outward testimonys, for without the certainty of the evidence the Judge can not pronounce his sentence. But is a man's own confessing or affirming he hath the true marks of faith enough to prove he has them? And what are the Witnesses, to apply the example of committing the murder, by which a man shall know he has these marks? and who must examin the Witnesses, and judge of the certainty or clearness of their evidences? Must it be the man that is accused? who useth that method? Doth not the man see how miserably his pittypfull example claudicats?

¶ 10. To my objection against the *Scripturs being the Only and Adequat Rule*, the example of deaf persons, idiots, infants, such as can not read, and are ignorant of the Original Tongues, so called, all which in some measure, less or more, are deprived of the benefit of the *Scripturs*, so as to apply them to themselves immediatly and effectually for a Rule, he asketh, *Whether if any such person in a land should kill a man, or do any thing contrary to the Law, would it not punish them?* And this he repeats, n. 35. in other words, which urgeth nothing, but upon supposition that the will of God can not be known otherwise than by the *Scriptur*, which supposition is false, and therefore his argument concludes nothing, yea himself confesseth that some things, and in particular *murder*, may be known by the *Light of Natur*, and so overturns his own argument. But he asketh *What use can children, or idiots, or mad men make of the Light within?* Answ. The *Light within* being affirmed by us to be a *Living Principle*, that quickens the Soul, may influence such persons, but so can not any writings. As for his learned Dr. Owen's book, which he recommends, he may find it answered long ago by Samuel Fisher a Quaker, which because the Doctor found too hot to reply to, I. B. that is so busy a body may supply that want. But most rare of all is his answer, p. 80. to my Conclusion, *that Christ would not leave his own to be led by a Rule obvious to so many doubts*, which is, and yet we see he hath done it; if this be not to beg the question in the highest degree, the Reader may judge. He confesseth *the Spirit is the chief Leader*: but to seem to come off with some credit, he falleth a railing upon me, for not distinguishing, but confounding the *Spirit's* work and the *Scripturs*, and then bestows many words, to prove they are distinct, with a heap of citations in the next p. 81. all which he might have spared,



untill he had proved first that I denyed they were distinct, or shewn where or when I confound them. What he writes, n. 38. & 39. p. 82. is meer railing, as the Reader by looking unto them may observe: he flouts there at my affirming *I know one, that could not read, discover an error in the version*, saying, *but the good luck was, himself was Judge*; what he would infer hence I see not, unless that their version is free of errors, which if he will adventur to affirm, his mistake may be shewn by the testimony of learned men among themselves and his own correcting it divers times, which will after be observed. He saith, *my speaking soberly of the Scriptures is only out of Policy, because the Quakers could not effectuat their poynt, which was to have the Scriptures quite laid-by, as an old Almanack*. But such malicious lyes and railings need no answer. To this he adds two other gross calumnies, to conclude his paragraph, *that it is the Quakers fixed opinion, that the Scriptures are not to be made use of in their assemblies, it being below them to expound any portion of it there, or to adduce any testimony therefrom for confirmation of their assertions*. This can be proved to be a manifest untruth by the testimony of many that are not Quakers, who have been witnesses of the contrary. The other, which he calleth *their constant opinion*, is, *that when one cometh to hearken to the Light within, he hath obtained the whole end of the Scriptures, so that they become wholly useles to him*: this is also a horrid calumny.

¶ 11. In his examining of what I assert to be the end and usefulness of the Scriptures, p. 83, 84. he can not find fault with what I ascribe to them, but that I give them not all; and whether I do wrong denying that to them which he would seem to give, the former debate will shew. But that he may be here like himself, he seeks to infer from my words most gross and malicious consequences, which are utterly false, and till he prove them, they need no other answer, but to observe them, and deny them, which I utterly do, such as, *that albeit Christ has ordained Pastors, and the Scriptures under the Gospel, to make the man of God perfect, yet the Quakers think they may be both laid aside as useles: that, according to me, the Scriptures are not so much as a subordinat Rule: that the Quakers would have all others save themselves to look upon themselves as not concerned in the Scriptures, that so they might be the sole keepers of these Oracles, and then, he saith, they shall quickly know what shall become of them: and that the Quakers always suppose that what the Spirit within them saith, can not contradict the Scripture, and therefore what they say contrary to the Scripture from the Spirit within must be supposed to* be



48 Of Man's Natural State, and of Original Sin. Sect. V.  
*be seeming, and not real:* this he repeats again (according to his custom) in the next page; if he mean the Spirit of God, I hope he will not deny it, and if he mean any other spirit, we deny it. But he would be fastening that upon us here, which may be justly said to them of their exalting their Confession of Faith above the *Scripturs*, as in the first section upon his Preface I observed. But he hath an objection which he urgeth, p. 67. and by which he thinks to overturn all, asking *if I believe the testimony of the Scripturs to be true?* Yes I do believe them, because the Testimony of the Spirit in my heart obligeth me so to do, and therefore being perswaded they are true I make use of them, though, in respect to my self, not in the first and primary place, but in a secondary, next to the Spirit; yet as to him I may urge them every way, because he accounts them so: and as to their testimony for the Spirit's being the Principal Leader, upon my using of which he founds his objection, (albeit, since he acknowledgeth it, he has the less reason to carp at it) I believe it from the Scriptur testimony, but not as the *primary ground* of my faith which I derive from the Spirit it self; yet as a *ground* and that a *very weighty* one. As for his other question *Whether I be of the same mind with other Quakers, of whom Mr Hicks reporteth*, I answer, that what is there reported by Hicks is false: and I here dare I. B. and his Author Hicks to prove it to have been said by any *Quaker*, which till they can do by good and sufficient proof, they are both to be held as *lying Calumniators*.

### Section. Fifth,

Wherein his Fifth and Sixth Chapters, intituled by him,  
*Of Man's Natural State, and Of Original Sin*, are considered.

I **A**fter he has repeated some of my words, he complains I speak darkly, and having given his usual malicious insinuations, that I do it of designe, and have some mysteries under it. He takes upon him to endeavour to guess at my meaning, and bestows many pages, to frame one conjectur after another, and then spends many words to refute these shadows, and men of straw of his own making: and yet at the end of all he confesses *he doubts whether he has got or hit my meaning*, and to be sure then he must be as uncertain that he has refuted

it; and therefore knoweth not but all his reasonings against his own conjecturs are impertinent, for after he hath written one conjectur, and bestows much labour in refuting it, his own words are, *p. 91. n. 5. if this be not his true meaning, let us try another Conjectur.* Which shews he knows not whether what he said before was to the purpose: thus he spendeth *pag. 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98.* in which last page he is very angry that I should condemne the *Socinians* and *Pelagians*; but the reason is manifest, because he would so willingly have it believed that I am one with them; and albeit I could not in reason be obliged to say any thing more to these pages, yet that none of these fictitious and false conjecturs may catch any unwary Reader, I do freely affirm that I believe man fell and was degenerated both as to Soul and body, and I understand the first Adam, or earthly man, to comprehend both, but that there was something in Adam, which was no part of his Soul and body, nor yet constitutive of his being a man, in my judgment, which could not degenerate, and which was in Adam by the fall reduced to a seed, and could never have been raised in him again, to his comfort, but by a new visitation of Life, which from Christ by the promise was administr'd unto him, and is to all men in a day, (for to say the affirming such a Seed remained in Adam, when he fell, doth infer his understanding was not hurt, and as he doth *p. 94.* is a consequence I deny, and remains for him to prove) That to believe there was such a thing in Adam, which the Scriptur calleth *spiraculum vitarum*, the *breath of Lives*, is no new coin'd doctrine, these may see, that will read *Athanasius, de definitionibus*, and his third dialogue *de Trinitate*, & 4 oration against the *Arians*, and *Cyrillus Alexandrinus* in his Treatise upon *John, lib. 2. & 3. & lib. 8. 47.* and in his *Tesaurus, lib. 4.* and others that might be mentioned. As for his arguing, *p. 96.* that because I affirm the *Seed of God is a Substance*, therefore according to me the seed of sin must be a substance also, which consequence I deny, and therefore what he builds against me upon this supposition falls to the ground. What he saith, here and there scattered in these pages, of the *Light*, will in its proper place come more fully to be considered.

¶ 2. *Pag. 98. n. 17.* after he has saluted me with the titles of *effronted* and *impudent*, he will have me one with *Socinians* and *Pelagians*, because I deny outward death to be a consequence of the fall; but where he proves I do so, I see not. It's true I say the death threatned, *Gen. 2: 17. was not outward death, for Adam did not so dye the day he did eat*, and I do still be-

lieve so, neither offereth he me any thing to give me ground to alter my mind: but to conclude thence I deny *outward death* to be a consequence of the *fall*, was too hastily inferred. But what if I were undetermined in this matter, and that it remained a mystery to me? (for I believe not the being positive therein essential to my Salvation) which if I were, truly what he saith seems not to me sufficient to profelyt me to his opinion; for albeit I willingly confels with him that *sickness* and all the other *miseries* attending this life, yea and *death* it self, considering the anguishes wherewith it is now generally accompanied, are the consequence of the *fall* and of *sin*; yet I see not how it would thence follow that Adam should not have dyed, seing death to him, if he had not *fallen*, would have been freed of all these miseries, and rather a pleasur than a pain, which has been known to have befallen many Saints. As for his *n. 19.* he confesseth the matter of it is left to the next chapter, where I may meet him.

¶ 3. *Pag. 100. n. 20.* he goes on at an high rate of perverting, for after he has said, *Who would suspect but I mean honestly?* he applieth to me the saying of Solomon, *he that hateth, dissembleth with his lips, we must not believe him, for there are seven abominations in his heart.* But why am I, w<sup>th</sup> him, guilty of this great charge? Because, albeit I affirm that *man is wholly degenerated*, yet I say, *Whatever good man doth in his natur, that doth not proceed from him, but from the Divine Seed in him.* Answ. These words are none of mine, but a forgery of his own, so incident it is for the man to lye and pervert; and therefore all his vapping and absurd inferences drawn from this, throughout this Paragraph, fall to the ground. My words are, *that the natur, by which the Apostle saith, the Gentiles did the things contained in the Law, cannot be understood of the proper corrupt natur of man, but of a Spiritual natur which proceedeth from the Seed of God, as he receiveth a new visitation of the Divine Love.* Where it is very plain, I consider *man* as visited anew, and that in the strength of that *Grace* thereby received (not of his *degenerated natur*) he doth that which is good. Nor do I any where say, as he fallily insinuates, *That this Spiritual Natur is in all men*, though I do say *That all men are visited by God, in order to beget this spiritual Natur in them*, as will after come in its place to be spoken of. Now all his battering of this my assertion in the three following pages depends upon this supposition, *That the good acts, done by the Gentiles, are not done by vertue of any such visitation, but only by a Light of corrupt natur, which remained in them after the fall:* so that

that it is but a meer begging of the question, untill that be first debated. But he thinks he has brought me under a great dilemma, p. 103. urging, *That, since I say all their imaginations are evil, I must say every Heathen has this Spiritual natur in him, yea and the Devils must be partakers of it, because they believe there is a God, which is a good thought.* Answ. He is too hasty in his reasonings: for that the knowledge a man may receive from the Divine Seed makes him instantly to partake of the Divine Natur, is not proved by him, and he knows I believe all men to be visited by this Divine Seed, which may give them an head-knowledg, which they may retain, as some men do the Truth, in unrighteousness, and yet not receive it in the love of it; so though they have it from a Divine Seed, yet it will not follow they must necessarily so receive it, as to become partakers of the Divine Natur. And as for the Devils, he will confess that once they had this knowledge from a Spiritual Natur, and though they have fain, yet they may retain the memory of it, for that their fall and Man's is every way alike he will not affirm. He saith p. 102. *That to believe good done by Heathens (that is, by such as have not the benefit of the outward knowledge of Christ) is done in vertue of a Divine Seed, overturns the Gospel,* but he leavs the confirmation of it to the sequel, where I shall attend him. N. 25. he tels me very fairly, *the Apostle doth not contradict himself,* as if I had ever imagined he did, but the question is whether the meaning he gives the Apostl's words implys not a contradiction, which indeed he can no ways reconcile but upon the supposition above denied; and the Reader may judge whether he or I do most fully acknowledge Man's fall, and most truely exalt the Grace of God, he that affirmeth *that Man, notwithstanding the fall, yet retaineth some reliques of the Image of God, yea so that the Law of God, which is holy, just, good and Spiritual, is written in his heart,* pag. 105. and all this considered as fain man, without receiving any Grace and benefit from Christ; or I, who affirm *That Man by the fall was wholly degenerated, retaining nothing of the Image of God, in whom albeit there remained a Seed of Righteousness, yet no other ways than as a naked Seed in barren ground, in vertue of which he can do nothing, untill visited by a new visitation which he receives by vertue of Christ as Mediator.* And yet while he ascribeth all this to unregenerat men, he saith in a few lines, *that the Apostle and all regenerat men are, in a certain respect, carnal:* so his Divinity will run thus, *the Devil and all unregenerat men are in a certain respect spiritual, and the Apostle and all regenerat are, in a certain respect, carnal.*

52 Of Man's Natural State, and of Original Sin. Sect. V.

¶ 4. But he thinks in the following page 106. he has gotten me in a notable contradiction, so that he concludeth if I may have occasion to contradict the Truth, I care not how often I contradict my self, and that is, by asking me this question, *Wherein appeared the wisdom of the wise men among the Greeks, if not in the knowledge of the things of God?* I answer: in the wise and prudent management of worldly affairs, for he hath not proved that is necessarily united to a knowledge of God and things Spiritual, since it is said of some beasts, that they have something of this, such as *Bees and Ants*, &c. And whereas he asks, *wherein man differs from Brutes then?* I say, in many things; as in the knowledge of Numbers and Mathematical and mechanical demonstrations; is the knowledge of such natural Truths (as 2 & 3 makes 5: and the *whole* is greater than the *part* and all that's deduced therefrom) the knowledge of the things of God? And yet is not this further than what Beasts know? And to shew him his forwardness in this, let him shew me, if he admitt not this, how the Wisdom of this World is Foolishness with God, and the Wisdom of God foolishness with men. At last he comes, p. 107 & to the end of this chapter, to prove that *there doth remain in Man some reliques of the Image of God, notwithstanding the fall*; which he builds upon that saying of the Apostle, *Rom. 1: 19. Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them*, and the reason he urgeth, is, *because it was known not to a few only*. Answ. This is very true, but makes nothing for him, for here (as for the most part elsewhere) he with an unparalleled confidence, not to say *impudence*, every where begs the question: First, in that he supposeth that this *γινώσκω*, or *what is to be known of God*, is somewhat that man retained in the fall, and no new *Visitation of Light and Grace*, which he knows I deny. And Secondly: That it must be so, because *all men have it*, where he supposeth that all men receive not such a visitation, which he knows I also deny, and yet he concludes, without offering to prove either of them. Who but one desperat, and that cares not how ridiculous and absurd he be, if he can but heap together a company of *railing words*, would urge his adversary by *mediums* which he knows he denies, without first proving them, or at least attempting so to do?

¶ 5. Next followeth his sixth chapter, intituled of *Original Sin*, in which nothing of what he saith can touch me, but so far as he proves *That those who never actually sinned, such as Infants, are guilty of Adam's sin*: Therefore what he saith of others, who affirm that *Man sustained no hurt*

*by Adam but by imitation*, concerns me not, since I say no such thing, and yet he thinks it a paradox for me to say (albeit he can not deny but it is true) that I deny the errors of such. And of this natur is what he writes in the first 4 pages of this chapter, in the last of which he goes, after his custom, as it were, to pump for the meaning of my words, that he may insinuat to the Reader, as if I wrot all in the dark, and had great mysteries under them; whereas any one that reads them may see they are so plain, that they need no commentary: for who is so weak, as not to understand me saying, *that the seed of sin is not imputed to Infants, untill they actually joyn with it?* He comes p. 114. n. 8. to examin what he saith I say in defence of this error. And first, he will take notice of what I say of *Augustin*, whom he alledgeth I abuse, because I say that he was the first among the Antients that opened the way to his opinion, in his declining age, out of zeal: but will he deny that *Augustin* wrot most zealously against *Pelagius* in his declining age? Next he shews here his great disingenuity, for while he names many of the Antients as being of the same mind, and whom *Augustin* also cited against *Pelagius*, he gives none of their words, that it might have been seen whether it was in this that they condemned him, to wit, *that Infants are not guilty of Adam's sin*: for these citations may relate to that which was accounted indeed *Pelagianisme*, to wit, *that Man by natur without the Grace of God could fulfill the Law, yea that he needed not Grace to perform the will of God*, which was the thing for which *Pelagius* was condemned by the *African Synod*. As for the citation he gives of *Augustin*, saying, *he was of the same mind, since the beginning of his Conversion*, seing in this place *Augustin's* words, which he saith he has held, are no more than the expresse words of the Apostle, *Rom. 5: 12* which I. B. has not yet proved to import that Infants are guilty of Adams sin: so if he has no better way to prove *Augustin's* positive judgment in the case than this, he doth but give a token of his own effronterdness and shameless boldness; not of mine. But since he seems so great an admirer of *Augustin* as an honoured instrument of the Lord, and an holy *Father*, as he terms him, then I desire to know whether he will agree to all that *Augustin* has written; which if he will not do, he doth ill to accuse me for condemning *Augustin* as erroneous in some things; and if he will, I may then shew him, that *Augustin* both commended and practiced things which he and his Brethren cried-out against, as superstition, will-worship and abominable Popery and Idolatry, and for far less than which



they have excommunicated their fellow-Preachers: which shews in effect meaner thoughts of him than I have yet expressed. My argument drawn from *Ephes. 2: 3.* where the Apostle ascribes the reason of *mens being children of wrath* to their evil deeds, he saith was the *Fathers* against *Pelagius*. And what then? doth that render it null? But his own answer to it is rare, saying, „ he thinks I put out my eyes that do not observe „ how the Apostle changes the second person, saying, *Among whom also „ we all had our conversation in times past, — and were by natur the children of wrath*: whence the man wisely infers *That Paul and the Jews were the children of Wrath*, which is not denied; but they must have quick eyes indeed that see it from thence to be inferred that they were such, ere they committed any actual sin, since the Apostle expressly mentions *his & their* having had their conversation among the *World* as a reason of their having been in the same condition. He saith further, I confess *1 Cor. 2.* that *Jews* is to be understood of the *Rational soul*: and what then? *Therefore so soon as they partake of the Rational soul they become children of Wrath*; This is indeed a rare consequence, but he must excuse me for not admitting it, till better proved. It would seem much more rational, to say, that so soon as they come to the exercise of their *Rational soul*, and then do evil, they become guilty; for he can not deny that the Gospel nor condemneth nor threatneth any man but him that has actually sinned, and whether this destroys not his cause the Reader may judge: That *except a man be born-again, he can not enter the Kingdom*, I never denied. Albeit children be capable of death, yet it will not follow that they are guilty of sin, since death is no punishment but rather an advantage to such, to whom it's a transition to a better Life. He thinks, *p. 117.* that my saying such as homologat their fathers sins, God will visit the iniquitys of their fathers upon them, is not worth noticing; but whether his answer be worth noticing, the Reader may judge, which is, *That Adam's sin was not a personal sin, as other mens are, and his own after-sins*; but the man forgot to prove this, and therefore may do it next: but he thinks the children of *Core*, *Dathan* and *Abiram*, of *Achan* and the *Sodomites*, were judged guilty of their Fathers sins, for unless he proves that, he saith nothing, but for what reason I know not, unless that they were outwardly destroyed: but untill he prove that infers *guilt*, he must forbear making his conclusion. He is highly offended I should say *their opinion is contrary to the Justice and Mercy of God*, alledging, it is without proof: but if to account

Sect.  
coun  
they  
sister  
merc  
the q  
cufin  
He w  
from  
theri  
so.  
them  
offer  
are fa  
beca  
so co  
1. Br  
live a  
mor  
then  
does  
Pop  
Pro  
anci  
com  
the  
ver  
pro  
the  
unl  
the  
cri  
Hi  
he  
ini  
m  
th  
fa



count one *guilty* for a sin committed by another thousands of years ere they had a being, and to punish for it, be not against *Iustice*, and inconsistent with *Mercy*, I desire to know of him what is more unjust and unmercifull. To say that this is an *accusing of God* is but a silly begging of the question, untill he has first proved his opinion to be true; it's no accusing of God to condemn mens opinions, when contrary to his Natur. He will have it to be a rapsody of non-sense, when I say, this proceeds from self-love founded on their opinion of *absolute Reprobation*; but whether it be or not, the Reader may judge, sure his saying it makes it not so. That this of *Infants being guilty of Adam's sin*, and therefore many of them being damned, depends upon their doctrine of *Reprobation*, no Man offense, that knows their doctrine, will deny; since they say *some Infants are saved, because elected*. Are not the rest then, according to them, *damned, because reprobated*? He gives me nothing here in answer but *railing*, and so concludes this Paragraph with this notable saying, *Woe, I say* (that is, I. Brown forsooth) *and thrice woe to such, as drink in this Man's doctrine, and live and dye accordingly.* p. 118. n. 14. He thinks my saying Papists are more charitable in allowing a *Limbus* to children shews my affection to them, but he has not heard me allow of their notion of a *Limbus*, as he does, in the chapter of *Iustification*, p. 310. of the opinion of a certain Popish Cardinal, preferring it not only to what is said by *William Forbes* a Protestant Bishop, but even, as it would appear, to *Richard Baxter* his ancient Presbyterian Brother; and in pursuance of this he asks, *how they come to Heaven*, meaning *Children, who have nothing to do with Christ*? But then, what wil he say of those he accounts *elect children*? go they to Heaven without Christ? If not, the difficulty is the same way solved. To prove Children are under a law, and subject to transgression, he gives the common practices among men who forfeit children, yea such as are unborn, with their fathers, for great crimes. But in what countrey do they use to kill all the children, when the father is put to death for a crime? and unless this were done, his comparison infers not the poynt. His plain answer (he saith) is, *Adam his being a publike person*, of which hereafter. To my citation *Ezech. 18: 20. the son shall not bear the father's iniquity*, he preaches at large upon the Prophet's words, alledging his meaning is, that those persons he wrot to had so much sin of their own, that God might justly judge them, albeit he did not visit them for their fathers iniquitys; and this is the quick dispatch he saith this place receives:

ceives : it is a quick way to dispatch indeed, if it were valid, to make the meaning destroy the Text ; but men of sense use not to be sudden in receiving such dispatches. The words are plain and positive *The son shall not bear the father's iniquity* ; therefore, untill he give ground from plain Scriptur to take it away, it must stand, to the overthrow of his Doctrin ; for the greater sinners those men were, the more justly and deservedly might their Fathers iniquity be laid upon them.

¶ 6. Pag. 120. n. 17. he cometh from my confession that Adam was a publick person, to infer *That the guilt passeth from him to all*, and first in this page he affirmeth *that this sin of Adam's, from whence Original sin proceeds, is the sin of the whole natur of Mankind, and not like Adam's after sins and the sins of other Men*, which he confesses *are not the sins of the whole Nature* : and because upon this dependeth much of what he infers, he had done wel to have proved this in the first place by some Scriptur, till which time his inference is not to be received. For did Adam cease to be a publick person, after he had committed that sin ? If he say Yea, let him prove it by plain Scriptur, for I deny it : if not, then his other sins must be imputed to all men (which he denies) or els nothing can be urged from his being a publick person ; and while to urge it he asketh *Did ever any hear one flattered as a publick person, whose failings could have no effect, untill the persons represented did resist their approbation of it ?* For here speaking of *Failings*, he must either conclude, in contradiction to himself, that Adam's sins are laid to the charge of his Posterity, or his instance is wholly impertinent. And yet, to go round again, he takes notice, p. 125. that *the Apostle names One Offence in the singular Number*, as if thence he would infer *that one sin is only transmitted* ; but how he proves his consequence thence he has not shewn : for albeit by that first offence he gave entrance to sin, that being his first, yet it will not follow he then ceased to be a publick person, and if not, nothing can be proved from granting him to be such, as is above observed. Next, the words are *the offence of one*, and not *one offence*, as he would insinuat ; which (though in the *singular number*) may include *many*, yea all his *offences*. For whatever way he seek to urge this from this place as to Adam, the parallel will allow it to be interpreted of Christ, where the Apostle speaking of his *Righteousness* useth also the *singular number*, and thence according to him we might say that it is only the first act of Christ's righteousness that is imputed unto us, and none of the rest, so that we have nothing to do with his Death, Sufferings and Resurre-

ction.

## Sect. V.

## Of Original Sin.

57

tion. What thinks he now of his own Divinity? Let him loofe his ~~know~~ the next time, to give him one of his own modestest proverbs. The absurdity he seeks to draw from denying this consequence of his being a publick person, *that if Adam had stood, infants should have no advantage by him, since they have no hurt by his fall*, toucheth not me at all, who nowhere say that Infants have no hurt by Adam's fall. Adam by his fall lost his glory, his strength, his dominion by which he could have easily withstood the Devil, and came under great weakness, whereby the Enemy's tentations had already access to him, and he became very obnoxious to fall under them; and so all his Posterity are come under the same weakness and obnoxiousness to the Enemy's tentations, who influenceth them by entering into them, and powerfully inclining them to sin: and this malignant influence is that *seed of sin* in all men, whereunto they become obnoxious, by reason of the fall, which though in it self really sin, yet is it not Man's, but the Devil's, untill Man give way to it. But I deny not but the least yeelding is Man's sin, among which I reckon *concupiscence* to be one, and so differ from *Papists*. For albeit the *temptation* simply considered, or as presented by the Devil, be not Man's sin, yet if he have the least love or desire to it, albeit he joyn not actually, that shews his mind is already defiled and corrupted, and that he is become a partaker of it. Thus are answered his reasonings and questionings how this seed of sin can be, and yet not the persons sin, p. 121, 122, &c. as the Reader by comparing may observe: only it is remarkable, p. 121. where he seems to put a great stress upon the judgment of *Augustin*, and citing him he brings him in saying these words among others, concerning Infants, *Shall they sin that are under no command?* Now since they who are under no command are under no Law, for every Law imports a command, how will he reconcile this saying of his holy Father, which he brings as a matter of authority, with his accounting it both *foolish* and *strange* in me p. 119, to prove *children are under no Law?* So that either the authority of *Augustin* he brings is not to be regarded, or his reasonings to prove *children under a Law*, that is, a *command*, must be naught: let him chuse which he will, and clear himself of impertinency. His argument in this page, that *as the Seed of Grace denominats a man gracious, even while not exercising works of Grace, so the seed of sin must denominat a man sinful*, is but a begging of the question, as in its place will appear, when I come to treat of the *Seed of Grace*.

H

When

¶ 7. When he cometh, p. 123. n. 18. to my answer to their objection *Rom. 5: 12.* among his preliminary observations the first is very proper, where he saith, *It is observable the Apostle makes comparison betwixt Adam and Christ.* I answer: it is indeed so, for as the *righteousness of Christ* is not imputed to men for *justification*, untill they actually joyn with it, or apprehend it by faith, (as himself will acknowledge, for I suppose by his accounting the *Antinomians* heretiks he will not with them affirm that men are justified before they believe.) so neither is the *unrighteousness and disobedience of Adam* imputed to men for *condemnation*, untill they actually joyn with it. but this comparison spoils all his doctrine. Then after he has begg'd the question awhile, by meer allegations, affirming his doctrine to be so clear, from the Apostle's words, that it can not be contradicted, without doing violence to the Text; he forms an argument thus:

*That sin, which is so described to us by the Apostle, that he saith it brought death upon all men, that men sinned by it, and were made sinners, even they who could not as yet actually sin, that thereby all became guilty of death and of condemnation, that sin by imputation is the sin of the whole nature, included in Adam, and rendereth the whole nature obnoxious to death, and to condemnation.*

*But the first sin of Adam is described to us by the Apostle, &c.*

*Ergo That sin is the sin of Natur, &c.*

This argument may perhaps satisfie such as are already profelyts of his Theam, but will not convince one, that either believes other ways, or doubts; since the *Major* is a meer begging of the question: and if any thing be a foisting-in of words to the text, this must be it, since he foists in the thing in debate, and words not in the text, such as [*even they who could not as yet actually sin*] and joyneth them with the words of the text, without distinction, and not as an interpretation, that his unwary Reader may conclude them to be of the text, and yet the man has the impudence in the same page to accuse me of *intolerable boldness*, as *foisting* words into the text, while I expressly shew it is but an interpretation, by saying *That is, &c.* so much is he blinded with self-interest: but I am content there be neither a ddition nor so much as consequence made use of. Let him shew me the plain Scriptur that saith *Infants are guilty of Adam's sin.* If he say it must be necessarily inferred from these words [*in whom all have sinned*] I say it as necessarily follows that it is only to be understood of

of all that could sin, which Infants could not, as not being under any law, as I have above proved, and *Augustin* (whom he so much reverenceth) doth affirm, if his citation from him be true: and therefore finding this to pinch him, he brings it up again, p. 126. where bringing me in saying, *Infants are under no Law*, he answers, *but the Apostle saith the contrary*. He would have done charitably to have told me where, that I might have observed it. What he saith in this as well as the former page in answer to my affirmation that *it* *may* relate to death, and that it's understood [upon which occasion man sinned] urging absurdities by the like application of Christ's Righteousness, is solved by a serious observation of the comparison, as stated by me, betwixt *Christ* and *Adam*. His arguing from *Childrens dying* doth not conclude, untill he prove *Death simply considered necessarily to infer guilt* in the Party dying, of which I have spoken before, p. 126. n. 20. to my answer to *Psal.* 51: 5. alledged by them, wherein I shew that *David* saith not *my Mother conceived me sinning*, and therefore it proves not his assertion. His reply is, after he has given a scoff, *it quite crosseth David's designe*. But why so? because in that *Psal.* he expresseth his sorrow and humiliation for his sins? and what then? might not *David* lament upon that occasion, that he was not only a sinner himself, but also came of such as were so? But when I urge this place further, shewing their interpretation would make Infants guilty of the sin of their immediat Parents, since there is no mention here of *Adam*, his answer to this is a repetition of his own doctrine. A rare method of debate, very usual to him! And then taking it for granted he asks me whether this originated Sin (of which he supposed *David* spake, for he never offers to prove it, though it be the matter in debate) came from another Original than *Adam*? What he affirmed here of my insinuating *Marriage-Dutys* to be *Sin*, is but a false conjecture; but as to the hurt and loss that *Man* got by *Adam*, which I ascribe to no other Original, as being no *Manichee*, I spake before: but he should first prove, before he obtrude such things upon others (and I desire yet to be informed of him) in what Scripture he reads of *Original Sin*, and whether, if the Scripture be the only Rule, he can not find words in it fit enough to express his faith, or must he shift for them elsewhere?

¶ 8. *Page* 127. n. 21. He urges *Paul's* saying *the wages of sin is death*, and to my saying This may be a consequence of the fall, but that thence it can not at all be inferred that iniquity is in all those that are subject to

death, he saith, *it is in plain terms (but my modesty dare not speak it out) to say, the Apostle speaketh not truth.* Answ. Is not this to take upon him to judge of another man's heart, which elsewhere he accounts a great presumption? & why takes he no notice, or gives he no answer to the absurdity I shew followed from thence? since the whole Creation received a decay by *Adam's* fall, and yet we say not *Herbs and Trees are Sinners*: and while he would make-out this great charge of my contradicting the Apostle, he forgets the half of his business, which is, to prove the Apostle meant, in that place, *Natural death*, and not *Eternal*, since the Apostle opposeth it there to *Eternal Life*: and *eternal death* he will confess is the *wages of Sin*, which the Apostle shews they shun by *Jesus Christ's* obtaining *Eternal Life*, whereas *Natural death* they do not avoid. Likewise he should have proved that all the Scriptures mentioned by him, p. 128. are meant of *natural death*, which he will find not very easy. As for his citing *Death* as mentioned by the Apostle, 1 Cor. 15. the Apostle's words ver. 56. confirm what I say, That *death* is only a punishment to the wicked, not to the Saints, for the words are, *The sting of death is Sin*; so where sin is taken away, there death has no sting, and that is the *Saints Victory*. Now he cannot apply this to *Infants*, without supposing that they have sin, which were to begg the question. And whereas he asks *Whether Death be NO punishment for Sin?* I answer that I said not so, neither is that needfull for me to affirm, seeing it is sufficient, if it be not always a punishment of sin; which if it be not, it can not be concluded that because infants dye, therefore they must be guilty of sin. Since then the absurdities he after urges follow from his supposition that *death* is No punishment for sin (which I say not) they do not touch me. He judgeth, p. 128. n. 22. that I run wilder than Papists, in saying we will rather admitt the supposed absurdity of saying all Infants are saved, to follow from our doctrine, than with them say, that *innumerable Infants perish eternally, not for their own, but only for Adam's faults.* This he reckons a contradicting of my doctrine of *Christ's dying for all*, saying, I here grant that *all Infants will be saved without Christ*. What horrible lye is this? Where say I that *all Infants will be saved without Christ*? If he say, it is by consequence that I say so, (which he must needs do, or els be an impudent unparallel'd liar) then he infers it either from my saying *Christ dyed for all*, I therefore if all Infants are saved, it must be without Christ; or that, If all Infants be saved, *Christ can not have dyed for all*: for one of these two must be, if I

con-



contradict my self. But such consequences are only fit for such an Author as seems to have abandoned all sense of honesty and Christian reprobation, and resolves *per fas aut nefas*, and *without rime or reason*, as the proverb is, to bespatter his adversary. As for his adding *they that have no sin, have no need of a Saviour to save them from sin*, he overturns it all by asking me, (in which also lies the pinch of his matter) since I affirm they have a *seed of Sin* in them, which is called *Death* and *the Old man*, how can they put-off this, and sing the Song of the Redeemed, which all that enter into Glory must do? Does not this then shew I believe they have need of Christ as a Saviour, who dyed for them, to deliver them from this? and is not the contradiction his own, in urging this question? which I thus answer, How are those he accounts *elect Infants* saved, whom he affirms to be really guilty of *Adam's sin*, and so in a worse condition than I affirm Infants to be? (for he will not say with *Papists* and *Lutherans* that the administering of that they call the *Sacrament of Baptism* does it.) When he answers this, he will solve his own argument. To insinuat that *some Infants* are damned, he asketh me what I think of those of *Sodom*, *Jude v. 7.* the words are these, *Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the Cities about them, in like manner giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.* But it is strange the man should be so desperately audacious, as to proclame his own sottishness to the world. Is there a word here of *Infants*? Is not the very reason of *suffering the vengeance of eternal fire* given? because of their *giving themselves over to Fornication*: which reason could not touch *Infants*. Pag. 129. he thinks I wrong *Zuinglius* upon the credit of the *Council of Trent*; but if the *Council of Trent* wronged *Zuinglius*, in condemning him for that he was not guilty of, he and his Brethren have the honour to have their judgment approved by that Council, while ours is condemned: and let him remember how he useth to upbraid me with affinity with *Papists*, yea in this very chapter, upon less ground. Pag. 130. he goes about to prove his matter from several Scriptures, but how shallowly, the Reader may easily observe. (1.) He citeth *Gen. 6 : 5.* *Man's thoughts are evil continually.* What then? Are Infants therefore guilty of *Adam's sin*, that's the thing in question. But the Hebrew signifies *à pueritiis*, from their infancy. What then? how proves that the case? I do not deny but Children may become guilty of sin very early, but the question is Whether they be guilty of *Adam's sin*,

even in their Mothers womb? And hereby we may see he thinks not their version so exact, but I. B. must take upon him to correct it, to help himself *at a dead lift*, as they say. The same way is answered the other Scriptures, that follow, *Ezech. 16: 4. Matth. 15: 19. Eph. 2, 3.* which are yet more impertinent, as the Reader by looking to them may see; and I might easily by examining them particularly shew, if it were not that I study brevity, and delight not to glory over the man's impertinency. And though Infants perished in the flood, and that was brought upon the men and women that sinned, for their iniquitys; yet it will not follow thence that infants are guilty of sins, untill he better prove that *natural death is always, and to all, the wages of sin*, albeit I confess with the Apostle *eternal death is*. And indeed if these infants were punished at all, it must have been for the sins of their immediat Parents, which he will not affirm, since the flood is not said to have come for Adam's sin, but for their own: so this instance clearly overturns his assertion. I leave to the Readers judgment the Scriptures not mentioned at length, but set down by him, in this to judge whether they prove the thing in debate, to wit, that *Infants are guilty of Adam's sin*. The citations out of *Augustin* and *Origen*, brought by him in the next page, 131. the Reader may also judge of, (in case they be truly cited, which I can not examin at present) whether they have weight enough to overturn what has been here proved from Scriptur. The words of *Eliphaz* (*Iob 15: 14.*) speak of a *Man*, not of a *child*, and therefore not to the purpose; neither do I believe, though the Spirit of God gave a relation of what *Eliphaz* said, that we ought to build our Faith upon his affirmations. Next he urges *Gen. c. 5: v. 3. And Adam — begat a son in his own likeness, after his image*; but this would prove Adam's sons as guilty of all sins, as that first, which he denied, or let him shew a ground for such a distinction. And thus is further answered what he saith, next page, *Gen. 17: 14.* where it is said, *the man-child that is uncircumcised shall be cut-off*, which he thinks so strong, that in a vapor he desires me to *chew my cud upon it*; for if this cutting-off was a punishment of these children for sin, it must be for that of their immediat parents, who neglected to circumcise them, which Adam could not do, and therefore could not sin in omitting it; and since he will not say this, he can urge nothing from that place. He saith the *Fathers* used to make use of these words of Christ, *Iob. 3: 5. Except a man be born of water, &c.* but their using it was upon their mistake that *Baptism* took away

Sect. VI. Of Reprobation and Univerfal Redemption. 63  
away Original sin, and that therefore infants unbaptized could not be saved. That *regeneration* is needfull to Infants I deny not: and whereas he asks *how are they regenerat*? I answered that before, asking him *how those he accounts Elect Infants, whom he confesses to be guilty of Adam's sin, are regenerat*? He confesses the *Fathers* argument, taken from sprinkling infants with water, (which they and he falsly call *Baptisme*) will conclude nothing against me: but since he names here *Initial Sacraments*, in the plural number, which the *Fathers* made use of, it seems they had some more than *Baptisme*. And since he and his Brethren make use of no more as *Initial* but *Baptisme*, it seems he differs from them, in what they judged needfull here, as wel as the Quakers. I have shewn above how I evite both contradicting my self, as to *Univerfal Redemption*, and excluding infants from the benefit of Christ's death. And for his last question, *wherein did Christ excell other Infants, if they be born without sin*? (he should have said [not guilty of Sin]) I answer, In that he had no Seed of Sin in him, as other infants have, and that not only, but he had nothing of that weaknesses and propensity to yeeld to the evil influence thereof, as other Infants; but was in greater strength, glory and dominion over it, than Adam, even before he fell: This shews his privilege above others, and in nothing contradicteth what I have said before.

### Section Sixth;

Wherein his Seventh and Eighth Chapters Of *Reprobation* and *Univerfal Redemption* are considered.

¶ 1. **I**N his seventh chapter of *Reprobation* he expatiateth himself at great length, in large and tedious homilies, which will make my reply the shorter, who look not upon it as my concern to answer them; because these controversies are largely handled by others, and what is said by him is abundantly answered: yet if he will affirm he has said something that is new, upon this Theam, and poynt to it, it is like it may not want an answer. And indeed the Reader may observe him much pained and strained to put a fair face upon these foul doctrines; and though what he saith here may be, and it is most probable, is to be understood of the reason he gives, in his Epistle, in being  
so

so large, because of the opposition of others, besides *Quakers*; and also because I touched these things but passingly, as being a Theam much debated, and common to us with others, I might pass it by, with a reference to those Authors, who largely treat of them; yet I will take notice of what he saith in direct answer to what by me is affirmed. And first, as for his accusation of me *as not being positive and punctual enough*, in setting down my judgment of the Decrees of Election and Reprobation, it is of no weight. All do at times confess that it is not safe nor proper too curiously to inquire into the Decrees of God, though this man dive into them; and be as positive in telling the several causes of them, as if he were upon the Secret Counsel of the Almighty! I judge I have said that which is needfull and sufficient, to wit, that God calleth *every Man* every where to *repent* and be *saved*, through faith in *Jesus Christ*, who tasted death for *Every man*, and is given for a *Light to enlighten the Gentiles*, & to be *God's Salvation to the ends of the Earth*; and therefore that Every man ought to apply himself to repent and believe, and obey, without believing that God has fore-ordained him to be damned, and therefore has withheld from him Grace and Power to do what he finds himself commanded and obliged to do: which if it were true, as he supposeth it to be of *most men*, there can be no reason why they ought not to believe the Truth. If he say they either ought or need not, because they know it not; Let him remember what pains he has been at, in the former chapter, to prove that *ignorance of a truth doth not take away the obligation of believing it*: so he must either overturn all, or be content this absurdity stick to his doctrine. As for his saying that the *Opposers of it do arraigne God*, and give a sign of their *Pride and arrogancy*, because they can not comprehend it with their corrupt and blinded understandings, it is but a silly begging of the question, and supposing it to be true. Thus every Impostor might intrude upon sober Christians wild absurd and non-sensical notions, contrary to God's Justice and Mercy; and because they would not accept of them, tell them, they arraign God, are proud and arrogant, and not receiving the Truth, because not comprehended by their corrupt Understandings. Would not this thinks he be wisely reasoned? But pag. 135. n 3. he thinks I run so furiously against this doctrine, that I run my self blind. And why so? because I say they affirm *That God did predestinat to everlasting damnation the most part of men, without any respect had to their sin, only to demonstrat the glory of his justice*: and upon this he rants as a ridiculous and false representation

tion

tion of their meaning. But this storm is quickly blown away, for all his great noise; for their *Westminster confession of Faith* saith, *chap. 3.* expressly, that *GOD ordained such as are not elected for dishonour and wrath, to the Praise of his glorious justice.* And the same *Confession* saith, in the same chapter, that *nothing future, or what was to come, even as fore-seen by God, was the cause of God's Decree;* and this himself also affirms, p. 137, 138, 139. What then is become of all his boast? But if he place it here, and say, *Sin became the cause so soon as [ to demonstrat the glory of his justice ] became the end,* and therefore they say *it was for their sin he so Decreed.* This may serve for a rattle to please fools and children, but not such as are spiritually wise, and look more narrowly unto things, since they so manifestly contradict themselves, telling, *Sin, nor any futur thing is not the cause of God's Decree,* and yet in a few lines, *that God ordained or decreed men to wrath for their sin, to manifest the glory of his justice,* which is as much as to say, God decreed men to be damned without respect to sin, and yet he decreed them to be damned for their sin. How makes he this hang together by Scriptur proofs? Besides, all will confess that the cause of all God's decrees is his own Glory, which is exerted in his Divine attributes, whereof *Justice* is one, so that this must be a cause, (before *sin* can have any place to be a cause) since they deny it has any. He tells me, p. 136. n. 5. that *the Orthodox have written copiously on this subject, and very far above my reach;* there was the less need then for him to write so many pages upon it, which must be little but a transcribing out of their writings, unless he think he has written more accurately and copiously than any of them. (which I judge he will hardly affirm) I might easily, if I would, trouble the Reader with a tedious discourse, also transcribe an answer out of those, who write copiously against these his supposed *Orthodox*, but truly *Heterodox*, men; but I rather chuse to pass it by, (not affecting to be admired for the bulk of my writings) to come to what he saith directly in answer to me, which is the business properly in hand.

¶ 2. After he has premised what he thinks meet, he comes, p. 143. n. 12. to take notice of what I say; and first wherein I misrepresents them, in which he saith he has found *no less than 12 untruths:* but how untrue this assertion is shall shortly appear. The first is, that I say, *God, for perfecting of this,* that is, for bringing his Decree to pass, *did appoint, that these miserable souls should necessarily sin;* this he saith is a mistake. But if the testimonies of *Calvin, Zanchini, Piscator* and others, cited by me, whose te-

Simonies must have more weight than his, to prove the *Calvinists* principle in this; do not prove this to be no mistake, then I may conclude that 2 and 3 makes not 5. *Calvin* saith that God not only predestinated men to sin, but to the causes of it, which is sin: the Reader may look the other passage of it in my Apology. Several of his other untruths, p 144. he builds upon supposing that I insinuat that they believe the Gospel is once preached to every person, that every reprobate had the knowledge of Christ, and that God had given to every one, that heareth the Gospel, sufficient Grace to embrace it. But truly I was never so mad as to insinuat they believed these things, for not believing of which I condemn them; neither will his pedantism upon the word *subtrahendo* make it out, since to withdraw or withhold may be said of things that man never had, without any great impropriety: and yet, according to him, all men had a will and power to obey God's Law, in Adam, so his ordaining Adam should fall, was even in that sense a withdrawing of what they once had in their Federal Head, according to his phrase and notion. Another of his alledged mistakes, is, that I say they affirm God did decree men should not obey; but whether these passages, I cited out of their Authors, do not make out this, the Reader may judge; yea his Confession doth ascribe the withholding of Mercy, which is the means, to agree to the Decree of Reprobation: so that all the fig-leaf coverings, whereby this man would fain shelter this opinion contrary to their publick Confessions of Faith and positive sentences of their chief Doctors, are too short and narrow to hide the ugliness of it. He confesseth the *Antients* say little of this before *Augustin*, I never so used their testimony, as to build my faith upon it, or to reject their doctrine meerly for its dissent from them, which he insinuates, and yet to his own self-contradiction confesseth I say I would not much regard all that, if it had any ground in Scripture; and he denies not his union with the *Dominicans*, and that he may shew how little he cares for good company, he willingly rejecteth the chief and first Reformers, to wit, the *Lutherans*, whom, according to his charity, he denieth so much as the name of Reformed Protestants.

¶ 3. Pag. 146. n. 16. He cometh to prove that this their doctrine maketh not God the author of sin, but he laboureth here like a man in a sweat, and giveth so little of a direct answer, as scarce deserves any reply, such as amounts to this, being by way of retortion, that, if I acknowledge God fore-saw sin, permitted it, and might have hindred it, I will make God the author



of *sin* too, but I deny the parity, and he has forgotten to prove it. His other answer is from the authority of *Cicero* and *Plautus*, who oppose *author* to *dissuasor*, and then he asketh *whether they say God perswade:th any man to sin?* But *Zanchius*, one of their Doctors, saith, *he moves the thief to kill, and that he sinneth, God putting him, yea forcing him to it, and sure that's more than perswading.* But the poor man must be at a low ebb, when he is forced to go to the Heathens, of whom he has expressed he has so mean thoughts, for a shelter to his doctrine! At last, to come off with some seeming credit, he desires me to confute the Apostle, *Rom. 9: 11, 12, 13.* because that he thinks from that, as much as from their doctrine, this charge may be inferred: but here he doth only begg the question, he and I do both agree that the Apostle *makes not God the author of sin*; but it doth not thence follow that their doctrine doth not infer it, since from the positive saying of their Doctors and the doctrine it self it is manifest, as is more largely shewn in my Apology, and this remains yet by him to be removed. For his desiring me to refute the Apostle is no more answer, than if to all his arguments in his book I should only say, Confute the Scriptur, which contains our Doctrine, and therefore dispute no more against us, untill thou first do that. Would he reckon this sufficient? As for their misapprehensions of *Rom. 9.* he may find them refuted in many Authors, that have written upon that subject, particularly in the examination of *West. Confess. of Faith, chap. 3.* to which I refer him. To the citations I give him of their Authors *making God the author of Sin* he saith, *If they give more ground than the very expressions of Scriptur, he will not own them.* And what then? the consequence is but very small, whether he will or not. It is enough for me that I have shewn the absurdity of their doctrine, which even by the testimony of their chief Doctors *makes God the author of Sin*; unless he will reply all this is nothing, because *I, I. B.* will not own them: and if to say *he that forceth another to do a thing is the cause & author of it*, who, without contradicting their own Reason, can deny they make God the author of sin? As for the many testimonies of Scriptur, brought by him, I own them; and both agree they make not God the author of sin, but that the saying of their Divines doth it, what is above said doth evince. Pag. 149. He cometh (but as may be observed, unwillingly) to vindicat the twofold *will* they ascribe to God, the one *revealed*, by which he commands men to repent; and the other *secret*, and quite contrary: how he is pained here, the Reader may observe by

his [*IFs*] [and *ANDs*] thinking to turn it by, without any direct answer. The sum of what he saith resolves in this, That the *Purpose* of God is not of the same natur with his *Command*: but what if that should be granted? The question is Whether they be quite contrary, and that in respect to one and the same subject; so that, when a man is commanded by God to do a thing, by his *secret Purpose* he is forced to do the quite contrary? *Pag. 150. n. 19.* He comes to answer my saying that their affirming *Man sinneth willingly*, will not avail; because, according to them, *his propensity of Inclination to sin is necessarily imposed upon them by God.* To this in stead of answer he refers me to *Rom. 9.* of which before; and, for want of reason, he falls a *railing*, calles me a *proud Quaker*, saying, *I agent the Devil's cause*: but whether that be to remove my objection, or vindicat their doctrin, the Reader may judge. *Pag. 151. n. 20.* In answer to my shewing their doctrin is injurious to God, because it maketh him delight in the death of a sinner, contrary to *Ezech. 33: 11. 1 Tim. 2: 3. 2 Pet. 3: 9.* he saith nothing directly, but would be retorting, that, if I prove anything from *this*, then I must say That God did absolutely Decree that all men should be saved. But I deny this consequence; albeit it is injurious to God, to say he decreeth that which he declareth to take no delight in, it will not follow that it is injurious to him, to say he permitteth what he delighteth not in. For on all hands it is confessed he permitteth sin, and yet on no hand that he delighteth in sin; so that this injuriousness of their doctrin to God is no ways removed by him, albeit he would fain be mincing and covering it, saying, *they do not say that God purposes to punish any not for their sins, but meereley to satisfie his own Pleasur*: but such silly shifts must only satisfie blind men. Do not they say God purposed to damn Many to eternal torment, and that *Sin is no ways the cause of this purpose*? And will he say to be eternally tormented is no punishment? And was not this a purpose to punish men, and not for their sin? His alledging, in this page, that this is not injurious to *Christ's Mediation*, is upon the supposition that Christ dyed not for all, which comes after to be examined.

¶ 4. *Pag. 152. n. 22.* He comes to prove their doctrin makes not the *Gospel a meer mock*, as I shew it did, by proposing the offer of Salvation to many, who yet by an irrevocable Decree are excluded from receiving any benefit by it: and to this he gives the instance of *Moses* being sent to *Pharaoh*, whose heart was hardened, and *Esaï* to the People of *Israel*, to make their ears heavy and shut their eyes, with others of like import. But  
this

this is easily answered, considering I grant many men out-live the day of God's Visitation to their Soul, and are justly hardned; and yet the offers of Mercy and Peace is no illusion, because they were once in a capacity to have by it received it. But he thinks here he has gotten me in a contradiction, because he supposeth that I willingly grant that *the Light within may continue to exhort such to repent and turn, whose Day of Visitation is expired*; but it is no wonder the man's arguments are weak, that are built upon so groundless suppositions. For I will never grant that the operations of the *Light* are every way the same in man after, as they were before, his Days of Visitation were expired; for, albeit before they judge, reprove and condemn for sin, yet this is accompanied with a gentle drawing and Invitation to Life; but that he has this afterwards I utterly deny, as is clear by *Christ's weeping over Jerusalem*. To prove, p. 153. that this their doctrine is not injurious to *Christ's Propitiatory Sacrifice*, by making it a great judgment and plague to many; he asks *Must not Christ be for the fall of many in Israel?* Luk. 2: 34. citing other Scriptures of the like import. *Ans.* All this urgeth nothing but upon supposition that all these never had a Day of Visitation; so that he doth but beg the question. His supposed contradiction, which he repeats again here, is before removed. Pag. 154. N. 24. To prove their doctrine putteth not men in a worse condition than Devils, he saith, *Devils are under no offer of Mercy now, and hear not the Gospel*: but is not this a pretty solution? whereas he confesseth this offer of Mercy and hearing is no advantage, nor was ever intended to advantage those who are damned; and therefore fore-seeing the weakness of this he brings in my words, where the pinch of the matter lies, to wit, *Devils had once a possibility of standing, but so not Men*, according to their doctrine: to this he has no answer, but that *all Mankind once stood in Adam*. But did not God decree that Adam should fall? Let him answer me this directly: where then was their capacity of standing, or his either? If he say not, let him take home his own reasonings, that something came to pass, which God decreed not, and consequently, according to him, fore-saw not. But suppose this difficulty were solved, let men of sense and Reason judge whether men be not put, by their doctrine, into a worse condition than Devils; while they affirm that *Devils had once a standing, and fell by their own personal disobedience and presumption, but Men had only a standing in Adam, fell by his act, and not by any of their own, all of them, before they had a being, and many severe*

70 Of Reprobation and Universal Redemption. Sect. VI.  
*10 thousand years before.* but, to befool his Reader, he saith, in the end of this paragraph, their *Doctrine is consonant to that Rev. 22 : 17. --- and whosoever will, let him take of the waters of Life freely*; and this he repeats in the end of the next paragraph. But how deceitfull he is in this, cannot be hid from the understanding Reader, since that *invitation* signifies nothing to those, that are by an *absolute Decree* excluded from the benefit of it, and is but to deal with such invited ones, as the Poet feigned of *Tantalus*, who was up to the chin in water, but restrained from drinking; which he takes notice of, as objected by me, p. 155. and labours to remove it, but in vain. What he saith to that end resolves in this question, *Have Heathens or Reprobats as great a desire to Salvation as Tantalus had of drinking?* And what if they had not? the comparison is not impertinent, for he, that hath resolved to starve a man, whether he do it by hindring him to eat, or by destroying his stomach, that he has no appetit, and therefore doth perish; doth equally contribute to his death. And the like doth their false doctrine most injuriously ascribe to God. As for the Scripturs here brought by him, such as; *all men have not Faith* 2 *Thess. 3 : 2.* and others of the like import, they are not to his purpose; for the question is not Whether all men have the exercise of those gifts that lead to Salvation? but Whether the most of men be by an irrevocable Decree, before they had a being, yea from all Eternity, secluded from all means of obtaining these Gifts; that they may be saved; and that because ordained to be damned, albeit by the Gospel, as the revealed will and command of GOD, invited to repent and be saved?

¶ 5. Now I come to his 8 chapter of *Universal Redemption*, where I shall not have much ado, for many pages; for after, according to his custom, he has introduc'd himself with railing and reproaches, and that in the first 4 pages he has told the various opinions of those that held *universal Redemption*, and at last his own, as conceived in the *Westminst. Confess. of Faith*; he goeth about to prove that there is *no Universal Redemption*, and that upon this medium, that *there was a Covenant betwixt God and the Mediator, which would be destroyed by such as assert this Universal Redemption*, because, according to them, *it might have saln-out, notwithstanding that Eternal transaction that not one person should be saved.* Upon this he enlarges, endeavouring to shew the absurdity of it both from Reason and Scriptur, unto page 194. All which toucheth me not at all, who do not say that Christ by his Death purchased a meer possibility, against which

he battereth through all these pages ; since I have expressly affirmed, and he himself observs it, that Christ's death purchased not only a sufficiency of Grace for all, but also such a prevalency for some, by which they were necessarily brought to Salvation : and yet is so unjust, as to affirm that I am for this meer possibility, saying, p. 178. n. 28. *I embrace this opinion with the Arminians*, and p. 179. n. 30. he saith, — *or as this Quaker saith, who in effect saith, that it may so fall-out that there shall be no application*: whether this be malice or forgetfulness himself best knows. But this is sad, he seldom forgets to be malicious, but often to be just ; yet as to the bulk of his reasonings of that matter, perhaps he bestows them for the confutation of those others he speaks of besides the *Quakers*, against whom he saith he writes ; who, if they judge it their concern, may answer it. Yet in this prolix disputation he has cast-in some arguments, which seem not only to urge against this *meer possibility*, as he terms it, but also against *Christ's dying for all* in any respect, such as from page 169, N. 19. to page 175. But these are such, as his usually are, which only proceed upon the question's being begged ; for whereas he saith *that those for whom Christ dyed, he dyed to take-away their sins*, it is not denied, provided they resist not the Grace purchased thereby, so that faith and repentance be wrought in them. But he urges this in the following page, 170. *that since this non-performance of the Condition is a sin, if he dyed for all sins, he must have dyed for this also ; and if there be another Condition imagined, for that too, and so in infinitum*. I answer: This reasoning would infer those to be saved by the death of Christ, who never repent, especially with those who judge *men may sin, yea must sin all their life-time, and yet be saved* ; neither doth the absurdity reach those who affirm Christ to have dyed for all, as to obtain remission of sins that are past, and Grace sufficient to work faith and repentance, yea and restore those that may fall into sin after their conversion, if not resisted : and this is sufficient to infer that Christ dyed for all, neither can that absurdity more reach them, than the Apostle, who speaks of such as *denied the Lord that bought them*. And since the Evangelist placeth the benefit upon the reception, saying *but unto as many as received him he gave power to become the sons of God* ; all these Scriptures, afterwards cited by him, signifying the efficacy of Christ's Blood, is not denied ; they themselves confels it was sufficient and of value enough to have redeemed every man : but that doth not hinder it from proving ineffectual to such as will not receive it, as is above shewn.

And

And therefore his question, p. 172. *If Christ dyed for the sins of all persons, how cometh it that they are not all actually pardoned?* is easily answered: Because of their non-reception of the Grace by which his Death should be made effectual to them: and albeit this maketh *Free-will* author of condemnation, as himself will acknowledge, yet not of Salvation, as shall after appear. His next argument, p. 174. is, that *If Christ had dyed for all men, all men should be saved, because he hath purchased Faith and Salvation for all for whom he has dyed*, and this he supposeth he has shewn before; but his confidence in his own arguments doth not influence other men, I am yet to see where he has proved any such thing. The Scripturs he brings, such as *Rom. 8: 32-39; &c.* to prove this, speak of those who had really received the Grace, and in whom regeneration was working by it, and do indeed very well prove that Christ dyed for them, yea what if I should say hath purchased them Grace prevalent to Salvation? Yet they will not prove that he has not dyed for others also that may miss of Salvation. Pag. 175. N. 25. he saith, *It is considerable That no where in Scriptur, we find it expressly affirmed, That Christ dyed for all Men. Why then is all this trouble made?* But is it not expressly said, *Heb. 2: 9.* that we see Jesus, — *that he by the Grace of God should tast death for every man.* Let him tell us what less that importeth, yea if it be not more emphatik, to say, *Christ tasted death for Every man*, than to say, *Christ dyed for all Men.* It is much the man would so proclaim his ignorance!

¶ 6. After more of his tedious and superfluous reasonings against this *meer possibility*, as he calls it, he comes p. 195. n. 48. to overturn my grounds for *Universal Redemption*; and first, in answer to the Angels song, *Luk. 2: 10.* urged by me, wherein they hold-forth the coming of Christ as tidings of great joy to all People, This he saith is to *shew the Offer was to be made now to all Kindreds, Nations, Tongues and Languages.* And what then? It is not said only so, excluding all Particulars of these, since the word *ALL*, in the common acceptation, comprehends *every Particular*, as well as *all sorts*; and he should have given some reason from Scriptur, why he restricts it here; but, in stead of that, he contradicts himself, in the very following words, saying, *for he was to reign over the house of Jacob. Luk. 1. v. 13.* for this if it urge any thing, it will exclude his former concession, if it be not exclusive, he can prove nothing from it. Neither doth he more pertinently alledge *Matth. 1: 21.* that *he was to save his People from their sins*, for that Scriptur doth not say, that he purchased not a capacity

fe



for some to be his People, who, by their resisting, lost the benefit offered them. *How often would I have gathered you, --- and ye would not?* saith Christ, *Mat. 23: 37. Luk 13: 34.* He saith further, *thou would not have been glade tidings, if it had been a meer possibility.* But I affirm no such thing. To my urging Christ's commission, *Mark 16: 15. to preach the Gospel to every creatur*, and that of *Paul, Col. 1: 28.* he saith, *it will no more, prove that Christ dyed for all men, than for Devils, and Beasts: for they are creatures.* But how silly and perverse this answer is, is easily apparent; for is it lawfull to preach the Gospel to Beasts and Devils? or is it as unlawfull to preach the Gospel to any men, as it is to do it to Beasts and Devils? But, on the contrary, since he will not deny but it is a duty to preach the Gospel to all men indefinitely, yea in this place he acknowledges it, they being the proper subjects of it; so that of them must be understood [every creature] here mentioned. *Pag. 156. N. 50.* To my arguing *the Gospel inviterh all*, and that it would be a mocking of men, if Christ dyed not for all, to command them all to believe that Christ dyed for them, he saith, *This is built upon an untruth, that the Gospel doth not command all, to whom it is preached, to believe that Christ dyed for them*, but only to flee to an all-sufficient Saviour. But what's the preaching of the Gospel, especially in his sense, even as a little before acknowledged by him, but a declaring and offering of Salvation to all, to whom it is preached, Mercy and Good-will, through the merits of Christ who dyed for them? Next, the argument still holdeth good, if the *Gospel commands* (as he saith) *to flee unto an all-sufficient Saviour*; for unless it be possible for such, who are to command, to do it, the preaching of it to them is a mocking of them, and that to purpose, if this impossibility be imposed upon them, by him, by whole command the Gospel is thus preached. The example of *Moses to Pharaoh*, and *Esaïas to the Jews*, has been before answered. He ends this paragraph, begging the question, *as if the Gospel could be said no where to be, but where there is an outward dispensation of it, by the ministry of men.*

¶ 7. *Pag. 197. N. 51.* He confesseth there is no Scriptur that saith *Christ has not dyed for all men*, and there is, that saith, *he has tasted death for every man*, which is rather more, and not a probation by consequence only, as I have already shewn: then he cometh to consider my argument from *1 Tim. 2: 1 3, 4-6.* shewing that Salvation can not be impossible for all, since we are commanded to pray for all; and that, since Christ gave himself a Price of Redemption for all, it can not be impos-

sible that all should be saved, as is more largely illustrated in my Apology. Now how he is pained in answer to this, and in his nibblings about the particule [all], even unto pag. 204. the Reader may easily observe. First he distinguisheth upon the word *possible*, it is meant (saith he) *here of such a thing as may be, abstracting from the decree, yea in respect of the Decree, the contrary whereof is not decreed by God, but not a thing simply so.* The man it's like thinks he has found-out a very subtile distinction, but it serves for little, save to shew his own confusion; for to be *possible, abstracting from the Decree, and with a respect to the Decree*, is for a thing to be impossible, if God had not decreed the contrary, and yet to be possible, because God has not decreed the contrary. But to leave this piece of confused pedantry: he denies that *we may pray for every one*, because John saith, — *there is a sin unto death, I do not say, ye should pray for it.* But this is in plain words to say, the Apostle Paul was deceived, and therefore his brother John reprov'd him: for the man labours more in this to make these two Apostles contradict one another, than to refute me. But for all this we see they are no ways at variance, *we may pray for all, because all may in a day be saved*, though, when some have out-lived that Day, it may not be fit to pray for them; but if Salvation were by an absolute decree made impossible for most of men, it were madness to pray for them: he thinks it may as well be inferred that *we should give thanks for all men.* This I suppose he reckons absurd: but why so? May not men give thanks to God, for, and in the behalf of, all men, for his Grace that he has given to all men, and also for his daily care and good Providence over all men? That, which he saith afterwards in many words, amounts to this, *that men have prayed allowably for that, which, by reason of God's decree, was impossible; and therefore may pray in faith for that, which is impossible:* of this he gives one great instance, from Christ's praying, *save me from this hour*, which is always with a submission to God's will. But this may divers ways be answered, for he has not proved that Christ's praying to save him from this hour, was in him a real desiring, however submissively, that he might not undergo that which he knew he came into the world to do. Neither can this be affirmed without importing that Christ was unwilling to do his Father's will, and desirous to shun it; which to affirm were blasphemy, to accuse him, who in all things was found willing and obedient. So that his Prayer was not a desiring the thing might not be, but that he might be saved and preserved from being overwhelmed with the difficulties and distresses that

that in that hour did and might attend him, and in this his prayer was answered; for, albeit these difficultys were not removed, yet he triumphed over them. That a man pray for the life of his father, or friend, who notwithstanding dyeth at that time, is not denied; but it will not thence follow, that it was impossible that those Prayers could have been answered. For to conclude from the events, that things could not have been other ways, were to conclude all things come to pass by a *Stoical* fate, so that God himself were *Agens necessarium*; and to favour of *Spinoza*, then it had been impossible for I. B. to have omitted, though at the earnest desire of his friends, one word of what he has written, or to have added one word more, and yet he saith, in some places, he *might have said more*. But the Apostle's desiring to pray here is founded upon the positive mind of God, *who willeth all men to be saved: this* (he saith) *is most false in the sense asserted by me, else all men should be saved*; but I never took it in that sense. The question is, Whether in any true sense it could be said that he will all men to be saved? and that given as a reason why we should pray for all, if God had made it always simply impossible for many to be saved. To shew that God's will of *Precept* (as his phrase is) may be impossible in respect of his decree, he saith, *God commandeth all, perhaps Devils and Damned to love him perfectly, and yet this is not now possible*. But this [*perhaps*] spoils all this inference, for untill he be certain of it, he can conclude nothing from it. He bestows divers pages upon the universal particle *all*, to shew how it is diversly taken, and by an instance of several Scripturs, to prove it sometimes is not taken for *all and every one*: but in this (had he not loved to be longsom and tedious) he might have spared his pains, since that was never denied by me. But the question is, that since the proper, common and most universal signification of [*all*] is to signify *every one*, whether, in the places brought by me, the most common signification should not be made use of, according to the general rule of all Interpreters? And therefore if he had said any thing to the purpose, he should have proved that in these places there must be a restriction, and not have bestowed many words to prove [*all*] sometimes to be restricted, which I never denied: and the pinch lieth here, wherein I desired to be satisfied, but find not as yet he has given any answer. Where is [*all*] made use of in Scriptur, to exprefs of two numbers the least? which yet, according to their principle, they make it to do; since they usually affirm that the number of the Elect is much less than

that of the Reprobats. After the like manner, ere he make an end of this, he would turn-by the word [*World*] as being understood of a *part*, and not *all*; but he is mightily pinched upon this occasion, where he comes, p. 208. n. 64. to answer what I urge from 1 *Ioh.* 2 : 1, 2. where Christ is said to be a *Propitiation for the sins of the whole World*; and that he may do it the more easily, he omits a long time the word [*whole*] to shew that the word *World* is sometimes taken with a restriction: and at last he tels us fairly, that the phrase the *Whole World* can not prove any thing, and that *It is but rational to suppose, that the whole World here denoteth no more, &c.* and for this he referreth to *Rev.* 3 : 10. & 12 : 9. & 13 : 3. &c. But these Scriptures are so far from hurting me, or making against what I say, that they confirm it; for I argued that *all* and *every one* was included by the Apostle in these words, wherein he saith, *Christ was a Propitiation for the sins of the whole World*, because he mentions the *Saints* before, --- *not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole World*, and so it must be the *whole world*, as contradictinguishd from the *Saints*. Now these places of the *Revel.* cited by him do denote *all* and *every one*, as contradictinguishd from the *Saints*, which himself I judge will not deny; for will he say that the *hour of temptation* (*Rev.* 3 : 10.) came upon *every one*, as contradictinguishd from the *Saints*? and that the *Beast* (12 : 9.) did in this sense deceive the *World*, that is, *all* and *every one*? and that (13 : 3.) *all the World* wondered after him? The other places, marked by him, have no relation to the *Whole World*, in the sense I here urge it; which is, that the *whole World*, when used in contradistinction from the *Saints*, expresseth *all* and *every one*: and the thing he should have done, if he would have truly retured me, which he has not so much as attempted, was to prove, that the *Elect*, or any part of them, as expressed by the word [*We*] or [*Us*] by any of the Pen-men of Scriptur, are contradictinguishd from the *Elect*, or any part of them, under the term of the [*whole World*,] untill he do which, he no ways overturns my argument, and therefore what he saith besides this, is beside the purpose.

¶ 7. Pag. 204. N. 59. In answer to *Ioh.* 3 : 16. compared with 1 *Ioh.* 4 : 9. *God so loved the World, &c.* and *God sent his Only-begotten Son into the World, &c.* he tels *whosoever* (albeit indefinit) is not *universal*, unless it be in a necessary matter, which this is not. But he should have defined what he means by a *necessary matter* distinctly, and then proved this not to be such; till both which be done, that's now omitted by him, his answer

is deficient. His next quibble is, that the *world* in these two places is not the same, the one being understood of the *Habitable World*, and the other of the *Inhabitants*; but the last may be understood of the *Inhabitants* as well as the first: where is the absurdity of saying *God sent his Son into the world*, that is, *unto men*, or *among men*? 3. He supposeth I will not say, *God sent his Son into the World*, that all *Inhabitants* might live the life of Faith, for all men have not faith, and all men will not be saved, or God should be disappointed of his Intentions; and therefore he adds, as his commentary upon Rev. 3: 3, 4. -- *what if some do not believe? shall their unbelief make the unchangeable Purposes of God of none effect?* No. Answ. I perceive, as most of the man's reasonings are built upon suppositions, so most of his suppositions are false; for God sent his Son into the World, to put all men into a capacity to live the life of Grace: and therefore who do not, the fault is their own, nor are God's unchangeable Purposes of none effect, since God has not unchangeably purposed to damn any, which he supposeth he did. And upon this meer and unproved supposition, according to his method, he builds his matter. He adds *Ioh. 3: 16* is directly against the meaning of his *Adversaries* (I judge he means all those, who assert *Universal Redemption*) *who build much upon it, albeit I had not the wit to improve it*: but it seems had I had a great deal more wit than I have, he judgeth himself to have wit enough to prove it all to no purpose. why? because, according to the Greek, it is, *for God so loved the World, — that all believing* (or all believers, or every one that believeth) *in him might not perish, &c.* And what then? we must prove, that either all are, or shall be Believers, and then he will easily grant, without dispute, that *Christ dyed for them all*. But the man has not here well heeded what he saith, there is no necessity of proving that all are, or shall be Believers; it is enough, to prove that all are put in a capacity to believe, and that Faith is not made by an absolute decree impossible to most: this in part is done already, and more of it will appear hereafter; that Christ by this place intended to shew, that his Death should not be restricted to the advantage of the Jews only, is not denied. In answer to *Heb. 2: 9.* that he *tasted death for every man*, he saith, that the Greek here, *for every man*, importeth in their room and stead, *shall we think that Christ dyed so for every man, and yet many of these men dyed for themselves?* But if any absurdity be inferred here, it will redound upon himself no less than upon me, who will confess, as his after words make manifest, the saying here *Christ*

*tasted death for Every man* imports his dying here for the *Elect*, and yet do not many of the *Elect* dye for themselves? Here again he saith, this sheweth the benefit of his death is not restricted to the Jews, which is granted; but that proveth not that it is not therefore Universal. Next, he taketh notice of the context, where it is said, *it became him, in bringing many sons unto glory, &c.* and therefore these are the *all* for whom he dyed. But this is strongly to affirm, not to prove; albeit Christ brought many sons unto glory, and called such *Brethren*, it doth not follow he tasted death only for such. The Apostle sheweth us first the general extent of Christ's death, in saying, *he tasted death for every man*; and then sheweth us, how it became effectual to many: and yet the man is so confident (albeit he has urged nothing, but only affirmed) that he adds, *if this context do not sufficiently confute this conceit, we need regarde the Scriptures no more.* But here he has spoken out the truth, as it is, for this evidently shews, that for all their pretence to exalt the Scriptures, yet they regard it no more than it favours their opinion. This is the account, for which they regard the Scriptures; if it favour their opinion, and confute their adversaries; but if it do not, *they need no more regard it*, else surely he should have said, *If the Scriptures do not confute that which he esteems an error, then he will not judge it so any more, but regard the Scriptures more than his own judgment*; but, on the contrary, he is resolved, if the Scripture do not confute what he thinks a conceit, *that he need no more regard them.* Likewise in the rest of this page he gives himself a notable stroak, for to my saying, *that their doctrine would infer that Christ came to condemn the world, contrary to his own words. Ioh. 3 : 17. 12 : 47.* he answereth, that prejudice has so blinded mine eyes, *that I can not see the beam in mine eye, for in my opinion, not one man might have been saved, because Christ only procured a meer possibility, and no certainty for any one man, &c.* But, as I have above observed, I assert, as my judgment, the express contrary, that Christ has so dyed for some, that they can not miss of Salvation; and this himself also noticeth afterwards, p. 276. I would know then, and let all honest men judge, if there be any spark of honesty left in him, whether himself be not the man, whom prejudice has blinded. Almost at the same rate, p. 207. he asketh me, if my argument from 2 Pet. 3 : 9. *the Lord is --- long-suffering to us ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come unto repentance*, do hold; *What will I do with those that out-live the day of their Visitation? is the Lord willing to give them repentance?* I answer, No: and yet



yet no overturning of my argument; for, in respect all had a day of visitation, wherein they might have repented, God may be said to be long-suffering, and not to have been willing any should have perished, &c. But this can not be said, if none ever had such a day, or season, as they affirm. He would insinuat as if *this made all to depend upon Free-Will*, but how frivolous this calumny is, will after appear: and whereas both in this and the following page he rants at an high rate, as if I did fight against God's Omnipotency, saying, *God will be God, whether I will or not*, and that *Christ must turn a petitioner, and supplicat Lord* [Free-Will,] exclaiming, *O cursed Religion!* the man doth but shew his maliciousness and weakness. For, if God's Omnipotency, because he doth whatsoever he will, be urged, to prove that men can not resist his will; and that therefore whatsoever men do, even the wickedest actions are willed by God, then violence is offered to the will of the creaturs, and the liberty and *contingency of second causes* are necessarily taken away; which yet is expressly denied by the *Wistmynst. Confess. chap. 3.* Nor will all his distinctions, far less affirmations, solve this; that *Peter* speaketh only of the *Elect*, because he mentioneth them elsewhere, unless he prove [all] here to be restricted, is but a begging of the question.

¶ 8. Pag. 210. n. 65: He quarreleth my bringing some testimonies of *Antiquity* agreeing with what I say, which he termeth a *souling of fingers with humane writings*, saying, *himself layeth not so much weight upon the authority of men in this matter*: and yet afterwards he cites some, as making for his purpose. He may know, I as little build upon the testimony of the *Ancients*, as he can, for the bottoming of faith; and yet to shew their agreement with us, and against them, is a good check to their shameless objection of *Novelty*, considering how the same is objected to them as strongly, and with no less reason, by their Mother, the Church of *Rome*, whom, when pinched by us, they begin to run to, for the ground of their *Church, Ministry and Maintainance*. That ever I said, the *Quakers*, whom he terms to be of *yesterday*, have only found the Truth, is false; albeit I say, they have a more clear and full discovery of it. But one would think, notwithstanding his pretending he lays little weight upon the Authority of *Antiquity*, in this matter, that it is not so; else why doth he so often in this matter upbraid us with the heresie of *Pelagius*, as contradicting the sense of the ancient Church, and their Doctors? Who are those, whose testimony he calls *the authority of men, in this matter?*

## Section. Seventh,

Wherein his IX. Chapter Of *Universal Salvation Possible*: his X. Of *Universal Grace and Light*. X I. Of the necessity of this *Light to Salvation*. and his XII. Of the *Salvation of Heathens without hearing the Gospel*, are considered.

¶ 1. **H**E beginneth his 9 chapter Of *Universal Salvation Possible*, according to his custom, with railing, accusing me of ignorance, folly, pride and pedantry; but he thinks it not worth his pains to spend words to discover it: yet he gives a main reason for all, to wit, I suppose our opinions were never known in the world, before we were raised up to declare them. Which being a manifest untruth, and never said by me, the Reader may thence judge of the grounds he has for this his Railing, however he supposeth they are but old errors clothed with new notions, and which himself has sufficiently enough enervated, in his former chapter of *Reprobation and Universal Redemption*; which being the basis of them is by him (if he may be admitted judge in his own cause) already overturned. And then he thinks it was impertinency, to say, that Quakers can by sensible experience be confirmed in their doctrine; and so brings to an end his first two paragraphs. His next work is to play the Commentator, and to tell his Reader my meaning, which to be sure is to pervert it, as he doth in this chapter throughout, affirming it to be my belief, that every man has power and ability moral to lay hold of Salvation, and that there is not requisit thereunto any new grant of Grace and Divine help to quicken the man; -- he has a stock from his Mothers womb, which is sufficient, this he calls the proper and native face of my doctrine; and this he putteth down as my opinion, and charges me with it, p. 214. And 218. he saith it further, without any concurrence of Divine Grace. Pag 220. he saith, I conclude Man has power to believe and obey the Gospel without the Spirit of God, as also the like, p. 221. twice. And p. 222. he saith, I conclude that the wicked have power, of themselves, without the Spirit of Regeneration and Grace, to do what is commanded in reference to Life eternal, and further, p. 223, 224 & 226. he affirmeth the like of me; which is utterly false, and was never

Sect. VII. Of Universal Salvation possible. 31

ver believed nor asserted by me: and it's observable, that in all these places where he thus charges me, he doth not so much as once poynt to any one page in my Apology; and not only so, but not so much as from the words or writings of any other Quaker, borrowed from some of his usual Authors, which is his most frequent refuge. And therefore the Reader may judge, what he builds upon his false supposition, or batters against it, fals to the ground, without further refutation. After he has branded this brat of his own begetting, p. 214. with *Pelagianism, Jesuitism, Arminianism and Socinianism*, thence accusing the boldness and confidence of the Quakers, and of my self in particular, in terming it a *new discovery of ours*; he endeth this page with a fit of *Railing*, and beginneth in his next to wonder, how the *Heathens* can be said to have a *day of Visitation*, since nothing can be called a *day of Visitation*, in reference to Salvation, but what is in and through the preaching of the Gospel. But this wonder is built upon his supposition that the preaching of the Gospel is no where, but where there is an outward administration of it; wherein his mistake will come hereafter to be manifested, into which mistake he falls, in the next page, and elsewhere in this chapter, where I shall pass it over, untill I come to speak of it in its proper place. In this page, 215. he thinketh that since I affirm their doctrine makes God *unjust*, as *denying to some the means of Salvation, that, which I affirm may be likewise so charged, because some may think God is not just, in not granting to all an equally long day of Visitation*: but the question is not what some may think, but whether these thoughts be built upon Justice and Reason? All men know it is manifest injustice to punish a man, and torment him, for non-performance of that, which he, that commands him to perform, has by an invincible necessity barred and hindered him from doing; and therefore to suppose this of the most Just God, must be a great error and abuse: but it is no injustice to punish a man, for not performing that, which he had received sufficient power to do, albeit another had received more, to say so, is like the labourers whom Christ reproves in the parable, for murmuring that those, that came-in after them, received equal wages with them, *Matth. 20: 12, 13, 14*. That the preaching of the Gospel is not a mocking of those, whose day of Visitation is expired, as it is to the Reprobats among them, I have in the former section shewn; but he asketh here *whether such become obdured before or after their Day of Visitation be expired?* What if I shall say both, though not in the same man-

ner and degree? it was before removeable, but not after; since albeit simply considered the same, and always pardonable, yet with a respect to certain persons and their circumstances, unpardonable, or not pardonable. That God permitteth sin to be in the world I never denied, nor accused their Divines for so saying: but whereas he saith, *it is a manifest untruth, that I would make the Reader believe, they say, God doth impell men to sin necessarily*, he seeketh to hide their doctrine, and beguile the simple Reader, since P. Martyr upon Rom. 1. saith expressly that *God forceth the will of wicked men unto great sins*. and Piscator saith that *the wicked are absolutely decreed necessarily to sin, and therefore to sin, that they may be justly punished*. Now these being more eminent Divines among them than I suppose I. B. presumes, for all his scribbling, he is to be accounted; the Reader may judge, and by the passages elsewhere cited by me, whether he doth not here most untruly charge me with an untruth: that the sins charged upon the Gentiles were only such as were against the *Light of Nature*, he has affirmed, p. 217. but not proved; for the great reason of their condemnation is, because *what was to be known of God is manifest in them*, and that this is not only the *lights of Nature*, will after appear. If what he urges from Rom. 11. concerning the *Jews* and the imprecation those brought upon themselves, who said, *His blood be upon us, and upon our children*, hold true, we must suppose no *Jew* since that saying of Paul and Barnabas, *Act. 13:46*. to have been really converted. But how came any of them to be converted before, since that imprecation was long before Paul and Barnabas spake these words of their turning to the *Gentiles*? and, according to this reasoning, all the preaching of the Gospel, which the *Jews* have since heard, and do hear, is in vain. I have sufficiently explained what I mean by this *Day of God's Visitation to every Man*, in the explication of the 5 and 6 *Theses* in my Apology, n. 17. And albeit he think otherwise, as I know I have satisfied many moderate Readers, who are not Quakers, so I hope to have satisfied all that are truly unprejudiced. After he has, p. 218. given large citations, to shew their doctrine, out of the *Confession of Faith* and *Catechism*, and thereafter made a kind of preaching thereupon, he comes at last, p. 221. to examin the proofs I bring for my assertion.

¶ 2. And first to my argument drawn from the reproofs in Scripture to men, for rejecting of God's Visitation and Love, he answers, that *my Proposition is universal, and these complaints and reproofs only particular*, and so

Sect. VII. Of Universal Salvation possible. 83

so can prove nothing. The like he answereth, p. 224. to what I urge from *Esaï 5: 1, 2, 3, 4.* where the *Vineyard* is expostulated with, as likewise *Mat. 23: 33. Mark 12: 1. Luk 20: 9.* and p. 225. to what I urge from *Mat. 23: 37. Luk 13: 34. & 19: 41, 42.* where Christ expostulateth with, and lamenteth over *Ierusal. m.* But for answer to all this, albeit these places were granted all of them to be particular, yet so much is gained by them, that some, that did perish, had a day of *Visitation*, in which they might have been saved; and thus his doctrine *Salvation was never possible to any, but to such as must necessarily be saved* is overturned, and he should at least have answered them as to this. Further, all the Scriptur reproofs and complaints are not particular, but some of them general, and one general one is enough to prove my assertion, (albeit as to that I may see what he saith hereafter, to answer that by which, as to the universality, it is more particularly proven in my *Apology*) such as *Gen. 6: 3.* which is spoken of men indefinitely: and whereas he supposeth *thou striving of God with men* to be only by his Word and Servants, meaning the outward Word; he doth but beg the question. Likewise that of *Micah 6: 8.* *he hath shewn thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?* where the word [*but*] doth shew this is all that is required, and that no more is required than is shewn to man indefinitely: others might be mentioned. And whereas in this and other places he saith, *my argument will not prove that men have power to lay hold on Salvation, without the Grace & Spirit of God*; it is true, for as I never affirmed any such thing, as is above observed, so I never intend to bring any argument to prove it. Pag. 222. n. 14. in answer to *1 Pet. 3: 20.* brought by me, he saith, I fore-saw it would be answered, *that the long-suffering of God, there mentioned, was not unto Salvation.* But the man is unhappy in his conjecturs of other mens thoughts; it will not follow, it was not to Salvation, because the Partys, towards whom it was, remained obstinat, and so perished: and albeit the Apostle *Peter* (*2 Pet. 3: 15.*) be speaking to his Brethren, who might have been advanced in Grace, yet he shewes not how it thence follows, that the *long-suffering*, there mentioned, is restricted to them only, the Text saith no such thing, and what though this Epistle of *Peter* was not particularly directed to the Romans, to whom *Paul* wrote? yet this being a general epistle included the Church of Rome among the rest, and others had need to have seen *Paul's* Epistles to the

84 Of Universal Salvation possible, &c. Sect. VII.

Romans, since according to him it was a part of their Principle, and only Rule of Faith and manners. But to overturn what I observed here from *Peter's* taking notice of some wresting Paul's writings, he bringeth nothing but his own affirmation. His answer to what I urge from the *Riches* and *Bounty* of God towards men, spoken of *Rom. 2 : 4.* which could not be, if Salvation were impossible to them, is, that the [*riches*] there mentioned is understood of the good things of this Life, contrary to the express words of the Text; which shews that the natur of that Riches and Long-suffering is, to lead to repentance, and ver. 7. eternal life is proposed as the reward of such, as by not despising of those Riches are led to Repentance, and continue in wel-doing. And whereas he adds, *this can not be done by the meer strength of Nature without the Grace of God*, I never said so; and therefore like to this calumny is what he saith, p. 225. where, that he may take occasion to rail and reflect, he would make his Reader believe that I argue, that, because men can do evil, they have therefore a power to do good, and then pleases himself to add, *these are Quaker-like inferences that want all solidity, and no little of sobriety.* At last he desires me to prove, that by the *Talents*, mentioned *Mat. 25 : 15.* is understood *Saving Grace*; but, if he think that be not meant by them, I would know of him what is meant: for it is observable, he doth not (because he dare not) deny that *Saving Grace*, or the means of Salvation, is meant by them. Doth not Christ make use of this parable, to compare the Kingdom of Heaven to it? and is it not of the same import with the former of the ten Virgins, five whereof, who had Oile in their Lamps, (I suppose he will confess this was *Saving Grace*) entred with the Bridegroom? Is it not said to those, that improved their Talents, *Wel done, good and faithfull servant, enter into the joy of thy Lord?* It is much the man had confidence to insinuat so much as a denial, that *saving Grace* is here meant. As to what he adds of this being not *Universal*, and not proving that men have power of themselves, *without Divine help and Grace*, I have answered it above.

¶ 3. I come now to his tenth chapter, entituled of *Universal Grace and Light*, where he grows warm to purpose, and rails almost constantly. He is scarce wel entred this chapter, when he accounts the further piece of our Divinity, as he terms it, and against which himself writes, as *nonsense and the foaming of a distracted brain*, yea p. 228. *such as he doubts whether it can be understood at all*, pag. 230. *whose meaning is unintelligible.* But what need he bestow near 40 pages, to refute *unintelligible non-sense*? For, if it



Sect. VII. Of the Universal and Saving Light. 85

be so, he can not be sure he has refuted it, since no man can be sure he has answered that sufficiently he doth not understand. And his malice has so overdriven him, that he writeth down his own judgment, saying, pag. 227. *some may justly blame him, for spending words, and wasting time, upon such a non-sensical, self-contradictory Proposition*; yet the man will be doing that, for which he confesseth he is justly blameable, and so much the more, as he further confesseth, p. 261. *that non-sense can not be well answered*. Of this violent railing take one instance, p. 248. where, in answer to my saying, that the *Light of Christ* will not consent to any abomination, but taketh away blindness, openeth the understanding, and directeth the judgment and Conscience; he addeth, *And while the Quakers preach up this, as a sure guide to life eternal, they are abominable Pelagian, and Socinian deceivers, who should be fled from, as the most impudent and sworn enemies of the Grace of God, and of his Gospel, that ever appeared out of the bottomless pit; a company of pure Pagan-preachers, whose doctrine is Paganisme, and driveth thereunto*. The Reader may judge of the rest, which he may find in terms no less abusive very frequent, pag. 227. 233, 234. 237, 238. 240. 248. 258. 260. 261. 266. All which railing, as it occurreth in these pages, needs no answer, but that of *Michael to the Devil*, who is the Author of such stuff, *The Lord rebuke thee*. This method of answering is no less unreasonable, than his railing, for it is either by supposing things not proved by him, by concluding things not following from my assertions, or by manifest perversions, all improved by the height of abuse, to render the things, that displease him, absurd and ridiculous: of these I shall take notice in order. First: He supposeth *nothing to be the Gospel, save the outward preaching*, and that there is no Gospel, where there is not an outward administration of it; and this he never offers to prove: what he saith to contradict my asserting the Gospel to be, where the outward may not be, will after be examined. Upon this his meer supposition he accounts me absurd, pag. 226. and upon this supposition he urges all mens *not having Grace*, as not having the Gospel, p. 235, 236. 240. that *to preach the Light within, is to despise the Gospel*, p. 244. that, according to me, *the preaching of the Gospel is not necessary to Salvation*. Another of his suppositions is, *that, because the Light within is common to all, therefore it can be nothing but Nature*. And upon this false and unproved ground he railleth, and enlargeth, p. 229. where he calls it the *Pelagian Grace of God*, that is, *Man's free-will*, doubting whether I will say so much as

did *Pelagius*; which is nothing to the purpose, neither proveth his inference, which is false, as the Scriptures, brought by me, in my Apology, to prove there is a *Saving Spiritual Grace* given to all, do evince. What he saith in answer to any of them, as it occurs, will hereafter be considered; and yet upon this false inference he concludes, p. 233. *the height of the Quakers Divinity is but what a Natural Conscience can teach a Man-eater, & to the same purpose, p. 234. and then battereth against it, p. 237. saying, Christ in the Saints the hope of glory is not brought about by Nature, which I never said; & therefore he but fights with his own shadow, as he doth upon the like occasion, pag. 231, 232-236-238. 241. 256. where he saith, that Men are not made partakers of the privilege of the Saints, in their natural state, and the Scripture saith not there is any thing in the heart of man by nature, which produceth Christ in the Soul, &c. which things were never asserted by me. More of his mistakes of this kind may be seen, pag. 257. 262. 265. where he concludeth the Quakers Religion and Gospel to be nothing, but what meer Nature teacheth; but it is observable, that, in that, almost one and only argument, which he bringeth, to make this inference good, (albeit much of his work and exclamations depends upon it) he involves himself in a notable contradiction, for (p. 234. n. 7.) to prove there is no *Universal Light*, or *Seed*, that beareth witness against all evil deeds; he asketh, *How came it, that this Light and Seed did not bear witness against the Cilicians, who lived upon theft; and against the Messagetians, who use their wives, in common; --- and against such as used to kill men and eat them?* Now these can make nothing for his purpose, unless for this reason, that, because these people commonly and avowedly did these things, therefore they had no *Light* that reproved them for them, otherwise their doing of them will not import the *Light* did not bear witness against their so doing, more than men under the *Presbyterian* Ministry, committing adultery and murder, will import there was no witness born against these sins, by the *Presbyterian* Preachers. But he has overthrown this his reason himself, by affirming, p. 232. & 235. *that there is a Natural Conscience, or the Law of Nature, left in every man, as God's deputy, informing of some good, and testifying against some evils, of which elsewhere he particularizeth murder and adultery; and yet here he saith, it is observed there is hardly any point of the Law of Nature, which some nation hath not violated, not only by their customs, but by their very Laws. If then their thus violating the Law of Nature do not prove they had not the Law of Nature, or were not reproved by**

it,

Sect. VII. Of Universal Grace and Light. 87

it,) which he himself has confessed all had ) then neither will their doing those things prove they had no Divine Light, nor Seed, or were not thereby reprov'd; for if it prove they had not that, it will as much prove they had no Natural Conscience, no Law of Nature, which yet he confesseth is in Every man.

¶ 4. In this chapter also he would insinuat and infer, to render that, which he writes against, odious, *that the asserting of an Universal Gospel, by which Salvation may be possible, to such as want outward preaching, renders outward preaching needles:* but this cavill, used often before by him, is already answered, in the 3 & 4 Sections; and therefore what he repeats of this again here, p. 229. 236. 245. needs no further answer. And whereas he asks upon this occasion, p. 244. *how can the believing of the history of the Gospel be necessary*, as I say it is, *to such as hear it, if they may be saved without it?* Because God commands every one to believe these Truths, to whom he bringeth the knowledge of them. (albeit not them, to whom he hath rendred it impossible) Has he forgotten their own distinction of some things being necessary *necesitate praecepti*, that are not so *necesitate medii*? Neither do I intend by this belief (which the proposing of the outward knowledge requires) a belief *meerly historical*, as he maliciously would insinuat. I shall now take notice of his gross perversions and calumnies, which, as he advances, I observe grow thicker, and are in this chapter very numerous: as first, from my saying that we understand by the *Light*, or *Seed*, a *Spiritual and Heavenly Principle*, in which GOD, as he is the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Spirit*, dwelleth: from this he infers, p. 231. *It may be, he doth not acknowledge a Trinity, &c.* But if there be any ground for such an inference from these words of mine, I leave it to all rational men to judge. Pag. 255. Because I say, it is Christ's flesh and blood, which came down from Heaven, he asks, *if Christ had no other flesh and blood?* & then, as if I had answered He had not, he concludes Us deniers of the incarnation of Christ, asking, *Whether the death of Christ, his resurrection, and ascension, and all the history of his Life, be but dreams and lyes?* which malicious insinuation and perversion is returned upon him, as false and groundless. And whereas he saith here, he will ask one word more, *Where I read that Christ's flesh and blood came down from heaven?* (for so my words should be translated) it seems he is either very ignorant or forgetfull of the Scriptures, and therefore let him read John 6: 51. where Christ saith, he is the *Living Bread, that came down from heaven*, adding,

ing, that *Bread* to be his *Flesh*. In like manner is his other malicious perversion denied, and returned upon him, where he would infer upon us, that each of us esteemed our selves as much the Christ of God, as Christ was: so that the blasphemy, he exclaims against, is his own, who speaks evil of others without a cause. Another of his perversions is, p. 236. where repeating my words he rendereth them thus, out of the Latine, *this is that inward Christ, of which we Only and so often speak*, whereas it should have been translated, *which we so much and so often speak for*, as the English edition doth verifie; the Latine word *tantum* signifies *so much*, as well as *only*, and was so intended here by me: that it must be so, both the context, and what I say elsewhere, sheweth. But he would have it *only*, that he might pervert and rail the more liberally, albeit he can not be ignorant, that the Latine word *tantum* signifies *so much*, as ordinary Dictionaries shew, and Cicero, saying, *nec tantum proficiebam, quantum volebam, nec quicquam posthac non modo tantum, sed ne tantulum quidem praterirum*. Those, who debate fairly, use not to strain their adversaries words, to abuse them, when they know they may bear a better interpretation. His next perversion is yet more gross and abusive, p. 238. where from my denying that we equal our selves to that Holy Man, the Lord Jesus Christ, &c. in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily, he concludes I affirm him to be no more but a Holy Man; and, because I use the words *plenitudo Divinitatis*, that I deny his Deity, which is an abominable falsehood, I detest that doctrine of the Socinians, and deny there is any ground for their distinction, and when I confess him to be a Holy Man, I deny him not to be GOD, as this man most injuriously would insinuate, for I confess him to be really both true God and true Man. And whereas he rails and exclaims here and in the following page at a monstrous rate, as if the comparison I bring of the difference betwixt every saint and the Man Jesus, from the sap its being other ways in the Root and Stock of the Tree, than in the branches, did further confirm our equalling our selves to him; he doth but shew his folly: since Christ himself useth the same comparison, Job 15: 5. *I am the Vine, ye are the branches*, to which I alluded; and upon this he runneth out in a vehement strain of railing, p. 239. exclaiming against us, as if we denied the Deity of Christ and his Incarnation, which is utterly false, and therefore his work there, to prove what I deny not, is in vain. And yet he repeateth this calumny, p. 242. adding, that my saying, that we believe what is written of the Conception, Birth, Life and Death

Sect. VII. Of the Universal and Saving Light. 89

*Death of Christ, &c. to be true, doth not vindicate us from it; and then he subjoins, Do you believe, that that Body, which was crucified at Jerusalem, rose again and is now in glory? Speak your mind here, if you dare; this defiance to all men of reason will insinuate, as if I did not believe this, or durst not speak my mind of it, and therefore if this be found false, he must, in the judgment of all sober men, pass for a malicious perverter: for answer then, I say, I do believe that the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was crucified at Jerusalem, was again raised by the Power of God, in which glorified Body the Lord Jesus Christ dwelleth; and I dare him to shew where in my Apology, or elsewhere, I ever said or wrot any thing to the contrary. Of the like nature to these perversions is what we saith, p. 264. where, from my urging from Heb. 4: 12, 13. the Word of God is said to be a discernor of the thoughts of the heart, he would infer, that the Quakers then must know other mens thoughts, who have this in them, and are sensible of it. But the absurdity here is his own, do not they say, Every true Believer has the Spirit of God in them? And albeit the Spirit know all things, yet every Believer knoweth not all things: since he is so ready by consequences to make men blasphemers, for asserting Scriptur truth, how can he avoid passing this censur upon the Apostle, who saith, 1 Cor. 2: 15. he that is Spiritual, judgeth all things; and no man can judge any thing but what he knows? And whereas he rails here, in saying, we ascribe to the Light within, the property of God, and have no other Christ; as also to the same purpose, p. 242. 237. saying, the Christ we command to believe in, is not the Christ the Scriptures testifie of, but one born with every man, neither God nor Man, &c. is all answered, and the absurdity he draws from it, removed, by what George Keith hath said, in his book, called, *The Way cast up*, wherein he shews by the extension of the Soul of Christ, how this is no denying of the Man Jesus, but, on the contrary. And, if either I, or any other, have called the *Light within*, God, or ascribed to it the property of God, it is no more upon this hypothesis, than they do, who say, the Man Christ is God, and, by reason of the personal union, ascribe sometimes the actions of the one nature to the Person denominated by the other, as the *West. Confess.* it self acknowledges, chap. 8. And since R. Macquair hath promised a refutation of that book of G. K. by I. L. in his name, when we see it, this may be further spoken to, if need be; upon which also will depend the full discussion of that question, mentioned, p. 240, 241. whether the *Seed* be a *Substance*, since he will not*

90 Of the Universal and Saving Light. Sect. VII.

deny the *Soul of Christ* is a *Substance*, and consequently distinct from *Reason*: as also that, of *Christ's* being crucified in the *Wicked*, which p. 246. he calls a *non-sensical dream*: and of the *Seed's* being a distinct Principle from the *Soul*, spoken of p. 247. the full treating of all which being referred untill that promised work of his appear, as to that I shall only say in short, at present, that whereas I say, *this Seed is not the being of God, simply considered*, he addeth, p. 230. that then all men are partakers of the being of God some other way considered; and what blasphemy is wrapped up here, he leaves to any that will, to judge. But there is no man of reason, dealing impartially, will judge any blasphemy to be here, more than in the Apostle's concession to the Athenians, *Act. 17: 28. that we are the Off spring of God, and live, and move in him.* And whereas he mocks, p. 241. at my saying the *Seed is a Substance*, because it abideth in the hearts of the Ungodly, even while they remain in ungodlyness, asking, *doth not Pravity, Ignorance, Rebellion, &c. remain in their hearts? Are these therefore Substances?* But he allays his own windy triumphs, by my following words, that notwithstanding this *Seed* is in them, they are not denominated by it, which wicked men are by their wickednesses, while they continue in them, and therefore it is a *substance*, since no accident can be in a subject, unless the subject be denominated therefrom. To this he asks why a man in whom this *Seed and Grace* is, may not be denominated *graced and enlightened?* and, as if it were absurd to deny they might be so denominated, he concludes, *And thus this Substance shall be turned into an accident, by this man's philosophy.* But the reason is clear, because they partake not of the virtue of it, nor have not suffered it to work in them, as by the example of *physik* being in a sick man I did shew; and therefore he has no go-by for this, but a piti- full impertinency, that if there be such a difference betwixt this *Seed* and *Holiness*, as betwixt *Physik* and *Health*, then it is no part of *Holiness*: for I never said there was such a difference, in every respect, but only in respect of the difference betwixt a *Substance* & an *accident*, for clearing of which only, the example was brought. And whereas he would several times insinuat here in this p. 232, 233. my asserting the *Seed* to be in all, did import *Christ dwelling in all*; that no such thing followeth, I have shewn in my Apology, which himself elsewhere observeth: for I shew there is a difference betwixt meer *in-being* and *inhabitation*, the last imports *union*, and not the first. Themselves confess God to be every where, and yet they will not say God dwells in the wicked; yea notwithstanding God's *Omni-presence*,



Sect. VII. Of the Univerfal and Saving Light. 91

ſence, it is ſaid, *Some are without God in the world*, by reaſon of their being not united to him. And thus is answered his cavils, p. 243. ſo that I need not further urge (untill he has removed this difficulty) from *Amos* 2: 12. only it is obſervable, how great pains the man is at here, to ſhew how faulty their tranſlation of the Bible is, but how can it then be a ſure Rule of faith to any? And whereas he ſaith, p. 236. that when it is ſaid, *the Seed is received in the heart*, it is ſuppoſed, it was not formerly there. I deny that conſequence, money may be brought unto a man's houſe, and yet he not have received it; the piece of ſilver which the woman, *Luk* 15. in the parable, had loſt, (and to which the Kingdom of God was compared) was in her houſe; and yet ſhe rejoiced not, untill lighting the candle and ſweeping the houſe ſhe had found it. What he repeats ſo often, to make an odious noiſe, of my making this Grace Univerſal, that *Turks, Japonians, Cannibals, &c.* have it, who never heard of Chriſt, is impertinent; ſince he has a chapter afterwards for that, of purpoſe, where it ſhall be examined: as alſo what he ſaith, p. 245. he thinks ſtrange, *any ſuch ſhould partake of the benefits of this myſterie*, for I ſpeak not of their knowing the myſterie. That's one of his uſual tricks, to ſoiſt-in other words, to alter the matter.

¶ 5: Having thus traivered his tedious perversions unto p. 251. n. 25. where he pretends to have traced me to my den, while he has only ſaln into the pit of his own making; I come to examin his pretended examination of the grounds I bring, for this he terms my wild aſſertion: and firſt unto *Ioh*. 1: 9. *That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world*. In ſtead of an answer he tells a long ſtory of ſome taking it one way, ſome another, then after he has plaid the Dictator a while, in telling his own conception, he concludes at laſt, *that every one is not to be underſtood of all without exception*, becauſe the Scriptur tells of many, *whoſe underſtandings are darkened, who are under the power of darkneſs, who abide in the darkneſs*. What then? that will not prove, that Light is not come to them, in order to bring them out of that darkneſs, ſince Chriſt ſaith expreſſly, *Ioh*. 3. of ſuch; that *Light is come, but men love darkneſs rather*, and theſe that love it, are under the power of it, and as they continue to love it, and hate the Light, they abide in it. But it ſeems, not being ſatiſfied with his own answer he proceeds, p. 252. n. 26. to confeſs *all men are enlightened, but not ſpirituallly, ſupernaturallly and ſavingly*, but for this he giveth no proof, but his own aſſertion; and truly he muſt

92 Of the Universal and Saving Light. Sect. VII.

be much puzzled with this Scriptur, for he knows not what way to take it, : *first*, he understands *every man* only of *Believers*, and then he will have the enlightening to be *saving & spiritual* then he understands it of *all* indifferently; and then he will have it to be *common & not saving*: but with these his guesings & divinings he is not like to satisfy any sober *Christian*. He goes on at the same rate of uncertainty, p. 253. upon these words, *that the Life is the Light of Men*, doubting what is the meaning of them. After he has told *Calvin's*, *Origen's* and *Marlorat's* thoughts, he concludes, that *though Light be come into the world, yet men love darkness better, and none become children of the Light, but by believing, and that all are not children of the Light*, which I never denied? He goes on to tell *Calvin's* further thoughts of the following words, all which shews this place pains him, but overturns nothing of what I have asserted, and then p. 254. n. 29. he refers me to his 8 chapter, to prove, that *every man* here admits an exclusion, which a little before he confessed it did not, adding, that the text it self inferreth a restriction, when it tels *darkness did not comprehend the Light*. But this imports no more than some rejecting, which I deny not, but not, that the *Light shined not*: for it is expressly said, *it shined in the darkness*, so it was there, which is the thing in debate, and the Text saith positively, *this true Light lighteth every man*; and therefore it is but to cover his own shame and weakness, that in stead of something more solid, he closes this paragraph with a ridiculous bob, saying, *Quakers are good at dreaming*: but this lilly covering will not serve him, with such as are not blind. To what I have said to shew that *si' autr* is to be referred to the *Light*, and not to *John*, he returneth his contrary assertion, in stead of reason. My shewing it, by its being said, *That all might believe through him*, which *all* could not do through *John*, as not hearing him, in stead of answering, he tels me, *I may learn thence how to take the particle [all]*, which in effect is nothing, but by his own bare authority, to command me to take *[all]* not universally; but I find no vertue in his order, to perswade, and therefore will wait for probation, ere I obey. That *John*, as an instrument, might be usefull, to bring people to believe in the *Light*, I deny not; and therefore he might have spared his pains in this page to prove that: but it will not thence follow that *si' autr* is referred to *John*, untill he first remove the ground given against it by me, in shewing *[all]* is not understood here universally, which is incumbent for him to do, since he denies it.

Sect. VII. Of the Universal and Saving Light. 93

¶ 6. Pag. 256. n. 31. In answer to my arguing, that *this Light is saving and sufficient, because it is the Light of Christ, whereby all ought to believe*, he saith, *they know no Light sufficient, which is not efficacious*, that is, which certainly doth not save. But besides that this answer is but a meer begging of the question, it is contrary to many Scriptures, which I have at length shewn before, in proving, many, that have had a day, have resisted the Mercy and Grace thereof. What he saith further here against those, who affirm that the improving of Nature aright shall obtain Grace, toucheth me not, who affirm no such thing. He beginneth his n. 32. p. 257. with a perversion, as if I denied that we received what is natural and common from Christ, because I say, the Evangelist *Iohn c. 1.* is treating of what we receive from Christ as Mediator, Therefore I deny we receive from Christ what is common and natural. But in answer to my urging the Light's being supernatural, (to pass-by his pedantik quibble, which he adventur-eth not to insist upon) because the darkness, that is, man in his natural estate, comprehendeth it not, but man in that estate can comprehend what is natural to him; he tels me, they thence infer, *that man in that estate is void of all spiritual Light*. Is not this a learned refutation of my reason, Reader? But suspecting this would not serve, he adds another quibble upon the word *comprehend*, that *though man in his natural state can comprehend that which is natural, yet he can not comprehend the God of Nature*. I say not that in his natural state he can, nor yet in his spiritual; *comprehend* being taken in the most comprehensive sense, but otherwise being understood of receiving or apprehending, for so *καταλαβειν* may be understood, he may receive it by virtue of the Power, which from the Light he receives, so to do. That the Quakers exhort people to believe in a meer creature, is a meer calumny, with which like stuff this page is filled; and therefore my argument of the Light being saving and supernatural, because we are commanded to believe in it, remains unremoved. Pag. 258. In answer to what I urge from the parable of the Sower, *Matth. 13.* and the word of faith, *Rom. 10.* and the engrafted Word, *Fam. 1: 21.* he only opposeth his meer assertions and railing, calling it *Quaker-dotages*, and a *fancifull dream*. And to the argument drawn from the *Talents*, *Mat. 25.* he denieth them to signify *Saving Grace*, of which above. Pag. 259. When he comes to answer what I urge from *Col. 1: 23.* of the Gospel's being *preached in every creature*, which is not only a declaration of good things, but the Power of God; he gives his meer assertions, that the Gospel was the doctrine deliver-

## 94 Of the Universal and Saving Light. Sect. VII.

ed by men: but the doctrine was not the Power of God, which the Gospel is, albeit it declared of it, no more than a receipt of *Physik* is the ingredients. Next he asserts, that *if the Gospel be in them, it needs no Preacher*, but this he proves not. A man may have good herbs in his garden, and yet need another to tell him the right use of them, yea and discover them unto him. And what if I would say, as he desires, *that it was preached from the beginning of the world in a measure*, that it wrought in mens hearts, in order to save them; albeit the full, plain and manifest discovery, and precious effects thereof, was reserved to the ministration of Christ and his Apostles? And therefore his assertion, in the next page, 260. is false, *that according to the Quakers principle, the Gospel was alike manifest, in all ages*. Was not the promised Seed a preaching of the Gospel to Adam? How poorly he has shewn the restriction of the particle *all* (albeit the words here be *every creatur*, which is more pathetik) in his 8 chapter, is before evinced. And whereas he desires to know where the Gospel is taken properly for *that inward strength that is common to all men*, I have shewn him, the Gospel is called the Power of God expressly, Rom. i. and that is an *inward Power and strength*; and then again I have shewn him, that this Gospel is preached to or in *every creatur*, which is plain words, what is preached to every creatur, is common to all men: and therefore, untill he answer this, his calling me a *babler* and a *Pagan-preacher* (as he doth in this place) with such like stuff, will have little weight with men of reason. The rest of this page, and the following, 261 & 262. is a complex of railing, *that the Quakers Gospel is meer heathenism, worse than Pelagianism, Socinianism, Arminianism and Jesuitism, because they say, that what is manifest from God in man, is by the Gospel, and that which revealeth justice and equity, is the Gospel*, which this man supposeth only to be the light of Nature, and thereupon concludeth, *the Quakers Gospel is but Nature's dimme and corrupt light*. All which is but to beg the question, as he doth, where he supposes that *man naturally can perceive the eternal Power of the Godhead, in the outward Creation, without any supernatural light*, which he should prove, and not mock at my being otherwise minded, for this favours more of *Pelagianisme*, than any thing asserted by me. He asks me, by what authority I make *το γνωστον το Θεου*, that is, *what is to be known of God* (for it seems he was fear'd to speak plain Scots of it, lest every one should have seen his impertinency) and *the knowledge of God, one and the same?* For to see this, he saith, he wants the *Quakers spectacles*. But indeed he must

SECT. VII. Of the Universal and Saving Light. 95

must be as dark-lighted inwardly, as these are outwardly, that need *speaks*, if he deny that the knowledge of God is somewhat of what is to be known of him, and then what is to be known of God indefinitely must comprehend the knowledge of God. He addeth, that if by *inward revelation* the Heathens know the will of God, then the Apostle was quite out here: but this follows no more than that a Matter teacheth not his scholar navigation, because he makes use of the compass and outward observations, to demonstrate it to him. Pag. 262. n. 38. as also n. 40. In answer to what I urge from Rom. 10. of the Word being near in the heart and in the mouth, he returneth railing, and meer assertions: for his saying that *this word is not in every man*, is but to affirm strongly, not to prove. As for his asserting that the Apostle speaks of *outward preaching*, I deny not; and that by an outward testimony the mystery, that had been hid, and even sparingly revealed, in the visible Church, was openly declared by Christ and his Apostles, I acquiesce to: but from all that it will no ways follow, that the Apostle spake only of *outward preachers*, and that it was not in the hearts of all men, though they had not a distinct knowledge of it. He confesses the *mystery of Adam's fall* was not known to the Gentiles, but by the Scriptur; yet that hindered not but they were hurt, yea and according to him, all of them defiled, by it. His saying, that I confirm here my *desperat designe*, and *overturn the foundations of the Christian Religion*, with his exclamations, *O desperat Souls! O wretched error!* with much more of this kind of stuff, uttered by him, for want of better arguments; may fright fools, but will not move men of reason. At last, to conclude this chapter, he alledgeth the testimonies of the Fathers, brought by me, do not expressly prove my assertions; yet he tacitly and indirectly acknowledges such testimonies may be found among the most ancient of them, while (albeit to their disadvantage) he saith, *it is observable, that some of them had so put-on Christ, as not fully to have put-off Plato.*

¶ 7. Pag. 267. Cometh his XI. chapter, entituled, *Of the necessity of this Light to Salvation*, where, according to his custom, he beginneth with proflous affirmations, and railing; saying, *the Universal Gospel, pointed at by me, is no Gospel, not the Gospel revealed in the word, making the whole Gospel and Grace of God null and void*, as that by which the outward administration thereof by the Apostles is unnecessary, to which is answered before. And then after an enumeration of many Scripturs, wherein the Apostle Paul glorieth in his being an instrument of the preaching of it, with which he hath

96 Of the necessity of this Light to Salvation. Sect. VII.  
 hath not shewn our doctrine inconsistent, he concludeth, *O what wretched desperado's must these Quakers be, who thus undervalue and trample upon the riches of the wisdom and grace of God, and instead of the true Gospel, give us pure Paganisme!* This is a fit introduction for such a chapter, wherein there is much of the same sort of stuff (which I shall willingly pass) and which, that he may end, as he begins, has the like railing conclusion, p. 281. Then, when he enters upon the matter, n. 5. and p. 269. and comes to examin what I say, to shew wherein we differ from some other assertors of *Universal Redemption*, and for that end, to shew why one is saved, and not another, seeing all have sufficient Grace, among others he mentions these my words, *Moreover we believe that in that special time of every man's visitation, as man of himself is wholly impotent for working with grace; so neither can he make the least progress out of his natural state, till grace lay hold on him. So that it is possible for him to suffer and not resist, as it is also possible for many to resist.* By these words of mine, cited by him, the Reader may easily observe how fairly he charged me in the fore-going chapter, with asserting that men could be saved by *meer Nature*, without the operation of the grace of God, and yet he is not ashamed to re-iterate the same calumny here, p. 279. But to proceed, he saith, *this my answer is not satisfactory*: the reason of which (besides some tedious discourse of the opinions of the *Arminians*, *Jesuits* and *Molinists*, concerning the difference betwixt sufficient and effectual Grace, which is not my work to answer, neither needs any as he gives it here and there, p. 270, 271, 272-274. 280. amounts to this, *that since the working of the grace comes from this non-resistance, which he saith is a positive act of man's will, then Salvation depends upon Free-Will*, and this he labours to aggravate by divers odious and sometimes ridiculous expressions, such as *Grace must stand, cap in hand, to Lord Free Will*, and more of that kind, alledging that the two examples of *sick men*, and men *lying* in a deep cave, brought at length by me, in my *Apology*, Lat. ed. p. 91. n. 17. do not free me of this absurdity. To which I reply (1) That the question is here only concerning such as have only a sufficiency of Grace, and not of those who have a prevalence of Grace, which I confess to some. (2) That I say not that any man can convert himself by any Light, Grace, or Seed in him, untill quickened, visited and stirred-up by a new visitation of Life from God. (3) That on both hands it is confessed, that there must be a concurring of the will of man, in the act of Conversion: for no man is saved against his will. (4) That



Sect. VII. Of the necessity of this Light to Salvation. 97

(4) That I say, as well as he, that this concurrence of man's will and pliability to the Grace of God, proceedeth not from man's will naturally, but is the product and effect of the Grace: then what has man to glory in? O (saith he) *such as are saved, may say I was not so ill disposed, my will was not so averse as another, that had the like sufficient Grace*; and what then? his aversion and resistance is the cause of his condemnation, that is not denied, but it follows not from thence, that the non-resistance is the cause of the others Salvation; I deny that consequence, for his non-resistance did not procure him that visitation from God. Where then is his absurdity? it may resolve in one of these two, *that it was possible for those that are damned, to have been saved*; or *for some of those that are saved, to have been damned*. What will the supposing that these, that are damned, might have been saved, amount to, but that their damnation is of themselves, which all acknowledge? And if he think it is absurd to say, any that are saved, might have been damned, why is Salvation preached to any? or to what end is pains bestowed upon any, in order to Salvation? or how doth that signify any thing really to their Salvation, if damnation was altogether impossible to them? When he has sufficiently answered this, he will solve his own difficultys. But because the man will always be n. b. bling, where he can not give a solid answer, therefore he falls a quarreling at some comparisons, brought by me, pag. 273-275-277. shewing they do not hit in that for which I did not bring them, whereas I took notice that the comparison did not hit every way. (since all comparisons claudicat) The first is, because I say, that *Grace softens the heart, as the fire softens the wax*, therefore he concludes, *that, according to me, Grace doth not change the heart, because fire changeth not the nature of the iron*; and what then? It was only with a respect to the softening that I brought the comparison, albeit, had he been a good Chymist, he might have known, that by the fire the nature of metalls may be changed also. The example of the sun's hardening clay, and softening wax, was brought by me, to shew that the sun loseth not its effect, though the operation in the subject be different, and for no more, albeit the sun also work a disposition towards the producing its effect in some creatures, which by their resisting or not resisting may be hindered.

¶ 8. When he cometh, p. 277. to examin the proofs I bring to prove the necessity of this Grace to Salvation, he mistakes the end, for which I bring them, and thence either alledgeth upon me false insinuations, or

98 Of the necessity of this Light to Salvation. Sect. VII.  
 judgeth them insufficient for not proving of that, for which they were never intended : for the end, for which I bring these proofs here, is, to shew, that, whatever use, profitableness, or necessity of believing, to those, to whom they are revealed, may be in outward knowledge, yet Salvation chiefly depends upon the inward work of Grace, bringing about regeneration in the Soul ; and this in order to shew, that where this is wrought, ( albeit the outward be wanting ) Salvation will follow. Now when he sheweth this is not proven by the arguments I here bring, he may be answered, and till then, it is in vain for him to say, *I would infer a destroying of the ordinances of Christ*, which is false, or *that this doth not prove that this common & sufficient Grace is able to effectuate the new birth*, that not being the matter here to be proved. Pag. 178. n. 13. he denieth the *new Creation*, spoken of 2 Cor. 5 : 16, 17. proceedeth from this *Light & Grace* : but his mistake herein will be shewn hereafter, from Tit. 2 : 11. when I come to speak of that place. He saith *that the manifestation of the Spirit, given to every one*, spoken of 1 Cor. 12 : 7. is only understood of those within the Church, but for this giveth no proof : if there be an enumeration made of all the several virtues wrought by it in the visible Church, it doth not thence follow, that none have it without it ; the text saith, it is *given to every man* indefinitely and absolutely, not to *every one only within the Church*, that remains for him to prove. He would fasten a contradiction upon me, p. 279. n. 14. because I say the Seed is small in its first manifestation, and though it be hid in the earthy part of man's heart, because *a thing can not be both hid and manifest*, and upon this he triumphs, as if he had discovered a great absurdity ; but doth he not know that that may be said to be hid, with respect to a great and clear and full manifestation, which yet may be in some respect manifest, at sometimes ? I do not say that absolutely it is hid and manifest at one and the same time. In answer to Luk 17 : 20, 21. brought by me, where Christ saith, *the kingdom of God is in the Pharisees*, he tels, judicious Calvin thinks these words were spoken to the Disciples : but he it seems is not of his mind ( and therefore I know not to what purpose he brought him, since he follows not his sense ) for he will have it to signifie [ *among* ], and the meaning to be, that the Kingdom of God was *near* and *among* them. But his proof for this is not valid, for it is sometimes interpreted *among* ; but the question is if it should be so interpreted here ? and till he prove that, he saith nothing. But his mistake here is greater than he is aware of, for the Greek word is *en*, not

Sect. VII. Of the necessity of this Light to Salvation 99  
 not *in*, which signifies *intus*, [*within*] and I desire him to shew me, in the New Testament, where it signifies *among*. All the Scriptures brought by him are impertinent, none of which is *in* as in this place, but *in*. He confesseth, p. 280. *the Calvinists make Grace an irresistible power*, but saith that they have reason so to do, because the Scripture speaketh of *Grace as a drawing and teaching*, for that may draw, which draweth not irresistibly. And because I say the Papists, Socinians, and Arminians deny this little seed and manifestation of *Light* to be that *supernatural and Saving Grace of God, given to all, to Salvation*, he bringeth two passages of the Arminians, wherein they confess the *Spirit of God works immediately upon the will, giving it strength to believe*, desiring me then to tell him wherein I differ from Arminians: but will my agreeing with Arminians in this prove I differ not from them? doth not himself agree with the Arminians, in saying, (as he affirms they do) *that the power of believing is conferred by irresistible grace?* And if he agree with them as well as I, may not I ask him the question, as pertinently as he doth me, *wherein differs he from them?* Has not he himself affirmed, *that as to our doctrine of the Saving Substantial Seed being in all*, pag. 226. *neither Arminians nor Socinians ever spake of it?* what then needs he ask me wherein we differ from them? But it seems he, that phancyeth men can dream waking (as he sometimes speaks of the *Quakers*) has been in that postur, when he wrot this, which helped him to conclude this chapter with railing.

¶ 9. Now I come to his XII. chap. entituled by him, *Of the Salvation of Heathens without hearing the Gospel*, he should have added, *outwardly*, that is the thing in debate; but as in the title, so in the chapter, he begs the question: and that he may begin with railing, as he ends it with a flood of it, p. 292. he saith, *to say, men may be saved without the outward preaching must be true with this Quaker, though the Apostle saith the contrary*, for this citing *Rom. 10: 14. Eph. 2: 12. 1 Cor. 1: 20, 21, 22.* all which say nothing contrary to my assertion, unless by the *hearing* there he prove is meant *only outward hearing*. And what though the Apostle say to the *Gentiles*, that they are *aliens to the common-wealth of Israel*, and that by wisdom they *know not God*, and that the *preaching of the Gospel was foolishness to them?* All this may be said of some living in, and esteemed members of, the Visible Church, who have the advantage of the outward preaching; and therefore it can not prove that the want of this takes-away the possibility of Salvation. To that of *Peter I agree, Act. 4: 12. that there*

100 Of the Salv. of Heathens without the &c. Sect. VII.  
*is not Salvation in any other, &c.* but it follows not therefore, that none can partake of this Salvation, without the outward knowledge: himself overturns this conclusion, by granting *infants and deaf persons may*. Pag. 287. To my argument, that since the Gospel is preached to every creatur, they may be saved by it, he saith, *a [may be] will not evince a [shall be]*; but I said only *may be saved*, not *shall be saved*, and if it evince that, it doth my business. That some have been saved without it, himself acknowledges, in the example of *Iob*. Pag. 288. To overturn my using of the Gospel's being preached to every creatur, he refers to his former answer to this place, and so do I to my reply. *Bez'a's* sense to whom he refers me, moves me no more than his doth, but when it is agreeable to Truth. Next, he comes to answer my argument, drawn from *Tit. 2:11*. *For the grace of God that bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men*, and for answer, he will have *[all]* here not to be understood *universally*, but with a restriction; alledging it is my part to prove it: but that needs no more proof, than to prove that *Iohn Brown* signifies, *Iohn Brown*, and for all his pretended skill in the rule of disputation, he is under a mistake. To take it *universally*, is to take it as the common and proper signification of it; so by the rule of all Commentators we are to hold the words of Scriptur so, untill by solid reasons we be moved to the contrary; and therefore it is his part that denies it, to give the reason: that *[all]* sometimes is taken with a restriction, I deny not, that therefore its so taken here doth not follow. That the Gospel is said to be preached by men outwardly, I deny not, but that therefore it is only so, and never preached, but when outwardly, by the ministry of men, is no conclusion: himself acknowledges, in the examples of *Iob*, who he saith was taught by God, without Scriptur. His other explications upon this place are his meer assertions, not to the business, he calleth it, upon the credit of his own affirmation, *false and childish pedantry, to say, they take [all] for the lesser part*, because they take it indefinitely, while yet they understand that indefinite number to be the lesser part; but do they not take the *Whole World*, *1 Iob. 2:2*. for the far lesser part of the world, which is yet more absurd? To my argument, taken from *Rom. 5:18*. where it is said, *as something came upon all, to condemnation, so something is come upon all, to justification*, which shews the last *[all]* to be of as large extent as the first, which they confess is *universally* taken, he saith, this will prove more, viz, *that all men are and shall be saved*, because judgment came actually upon all

Sect. VII. Of the Salv. of Heathens without the &c. 101  
 to condemnation, by Adam's fall; but this is only his own assertion, the word *judgment* is not in the text, and Beza's putting in *reatus* or *guilt* proveth not it ought to be so, whatever he do, we account not Beza infallible, and therefore reject his sense, untill he prove it agreeable to Scripture: nor yet his enlargements afterwards upon the place, because alledged without probation. Pag. 285. n. 5. He accounteth my citing *Esaï 49:6.* where Christ is said to be *given for a Light to the Gentiles*, impertinent, because albeit the Gentiles are not excluded from the dispensation of the Gospel, it will not follow that such as hear not of Christ can be saved, as well as such as are brought within the Church. But this answer is founded upon the supposition, that I affirm, *that any are saved, which are not within the Church Catholick or universal*, which is false. And how men may be of the Church, who want outward preaching, will after appear. I think no sober man will deny (supposing Salvation possible to the Gentiles, without outward preaching) that it were blind charity, to judge some of them have been saved, for upon that supposition, it were against all charity, to say, none of them were ever saved. His example of the *captives*, to whom one, that redeemed them, did not communicate the conditions, remaining really *captives*, to answer my argument from the rule of Contraries, *that as men are hurt by Adam's fall, who know not of it, so they may be benefited by Christ's death, who know not of it*, hitteth not the matter; it is as strange for men to be captives, and not to know how, nor by whom, as to be redeemed, and not know how, nor by whom, if he suppose the first, he may do the last: and this example himself overturns in what he grants of *deaf persons* and *children*, as will after appear. To my asking Why men can not be saved, who never heard of the death and resurrection of Christ, as well as men are damned who never heard of Adam's sin; he tels me very fairly, *because God hath appointed this way of Salvation by faith in Christ, which can not be without the knowledge of Christ*, by which he meaning the outward, as he needs must, his answer is none at all, but a ridiculous begging of the question, as he doth also, when he mentions that *Esaï 53:11. by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many*: for though that should be understood of outward knowledge, which yet remains for him to prove, it will not follow because Christ shall justify many by that knowledge, that therefore he shall justify none without it.

¶ 10. When he comes, pag. 186. n. 7. to answer what I urge from  
 N 3 the

102 Of the Saly. of Heathens without the &c. Sect. VII.  
 the example of *Deaf persons and Infants*, the Reader may observe how much he is pained; so that he is forced, after so long contending and wearisom wrestling, at last to give away his cause, by confessing *they except both these from the necessity of outwardly hearing the Gospel*: if so, then Salvation is impossible, without the hearing of the Gospel, and the outward preaching of the Gospel is not of absolute necessity to Salvation. But why are they, and they only, excepted? in which resolves my question, (which doth so vex him, that, in stead of answering, he tells me, *I am a deluded Quaker*) of which this is one, *Is not one in China or India as excusable for not knowing that, which they never heard, as a deaf man, that can not hear, since God, that has permitted the one to be naturally deaf, has also permitted the other to be necessarily absent?* To this I can not find his answer, save only this, *that these deaf persons and infants are members of the visible Church, but not the other*, of which this must be the consequence, that none can be saved, but such as are members of the visible Church; for his saying, that none are members of the invisible Church, but such as are of the visible, clearly imports it. But has not he, or at least the most eminent of his way, said, that the Church was many ages invisible, and in the wilderness, and yet denied that all were damned, during that time? Or will he say, the Church of *Rome* was the visible Church of Christ, all that time, of which they were members? What then becomes of the testimonies of those, who termed her *Antichrist, the mother of abominations, the synagogue of Satan*? which albeit true, yet begins to be eaten up again by the Clergy, yea even the *Presbyterians*, who begin by degrees to creep back again to acknowledge their old father, the *Pope*, to establish their Succession and Ordination, especially when pinched by the *Quakers*, as is at more length shewn in *G. Keith's* book, called *Quakerism no Popery*.? But further, it seems the outward hearing is not necessary to make a man a member of the visible Church, and then what becomes of all his tedious reasonings from *Rom. 10. How shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard*, which he urged before so vehemently, but now has overturned? He thinks the instance of *Cornelius* not to the purpose, because he might have had the knowledge of the *Messias* from the Jews: but his bare supposition is no answer, besides, that he was no Jew's profelyte, is manifest, else *Peter* should not have been quarrelled for conversing with him; and unless he had been such, or had received the Gospel, according to him, he must be esteemed to have been within the *Covenant*,  
 and



Seft. VII. Of the Salv. of Heathens without the &c. 103  
and yet before any of these, he is said to have been heard of God, and  
accepted. Pag. 289. He confesseth *Iob lived before Moses, and was taught  
of God without Scriptur*, and then is it not thence manifest, that some have  
been saved, to whom the Gospel was not preached by the ministry of  
men? This also overturneth his arguments from *Rom. 10.* Because he  
knows not how to answer my argument drawn from *Rom. 2.* therefore to  
amuse his Reader, he raises a storm of railing, calling me no less, with  
an exclamation, than a *miserable miscreant, who make the Apostle contradict  
himself.* My argument lies in the Apostle's positive words, who saith,  
*the Gentiles did the things contained in the Law*, and again, in the same chap-  
ter, ver. 13. *the doers of the Law are justified*; whence in the very words of  
the Apostle, without any commentary, I argue, *that if the doers of the Law  
be justified*, then *the Gentiles, who did the things contained in the Law, are ju-  
stified*: do I therefore make the Apostle contradict himself? Yea saith  
he, because the same Apostle saith, that *by the deeds of the Law no flesh  
shall be justified*: but will he say, that these two sentences of this Apostle,  
*the doers of the Law shall be justified*, and *by the deeds of the Law no flesh shall be  
justified*, are contradictory? I say, they are not. If both these sayings be  
true, his challenge is in vain, if he will speak-out that which he must;  
else manifest his abuse of me, and say they contradict one another, then  
let the Reader judge who is the *miscreant*, and observe how he fals himself  
into the pit, he had prepared for another. But, to shew how this distinct  
outward knowledge was not absolutely needfull to Salvation, I instanc-  
ed how that divers of the *Patriarchs*, yea *Mary*, and the *Apostles* them-  
selves, had not so clear a knowledge of it, but appeared ignorant upon se-  
veral occasions: to this, p. 289. he would make the Reader believe,  
that I conclude *the Patriarchs had no saving knowledge of the Messias, because  
the wicked Jews crucified him*, which is false; I shew indeed, according  
to Scriptur, that the Jews, that crucified him, wanted this distinct know-  
ledge, notwithstanding they had the Scriptur. His further answer to  
this confutes himself, saying, *the Apostles did understand so much as was then  
revealed*; and if this was sufficient for them, as he must say, if he speak  
sense, the like may be said of the *Heathens*: for, if the Apostles were  
not condemnable for not believing nor understanding more than what  
was revealed to them, neither could the Gentiles. But, to make his un-  
wary Reader believe as if all this said by me brought no relief to my  
*desperate cause*, as he terms it, he concludes this 11 Paragraph, p. 290.  
with

with one of his sententious sayings, *Quakers can dream waking, I see*. He goes on in answer to my proofs brought from the antient Philosophers to confirm this, to which he resumes little but railing, wherein I will not trouble the Reader to follow him, since without them the thing in hand is sufficiently proved by Scriptur; yet if he will affirm the citations to be either false or fictitious, they may be proved by production of the books themselves. He thinks the impertinency of my citing *Augustin's* words is discovered by the bare reading, and little less he saith to those of *Buchanan*, which I refer to the Readers judgment, as he will find them in my Apology, towards the latter end of the explanation of the 5 and 6 Propositions; and I will leave him concluding this chapter with railing, and empty threats, which I neither fear nor value, as being without ground, and the fruits of no better spirit, than that of *Rabshakeh*.

### Section. Eighth,

Wherein his thirteenth Chapter *Of Justification* is considered.

¶ 1. **I** come now to his thirteenth chapter *Of Justification*, where, after he has begun by telling this doctrin hath been principally questioned by Heretiks, which I deny not, and given us, according to his custom, some large citations out of their *Confession of Faith* and *Catechism*, with the supposed sense of other *Quakers*, from some of his formerly mentioned partial Authors; at last he comes pag. 296. n. 4. to examin what I say in this matter: where, according to his custom, he begins with a calumny, upon his own false supposition, as if the *justification*, I plead for, were not the true justification of the Saints, because proceeding from the Light, which (saith he) is but the dimme light of nature. This he takes for granted to be true, and thence falsely makes his inference, pag. 297, 298. 307, 308. 324. To this he adds another perversion, as if, because I say from the Light received proceeds an holy birth, therefore there were no infusion of any gracious Principle or Vertue, &c. which is false. Men use to say, that where seed is received in the earth, it grows up to fruit, yet not without the influence of the Sun, and descending of rain; so is it with this Spiritual Seed, but with this difference, that where-ever this Seed is, God is never wanting to give his Heav-  
enly

venly influences, towards its growth & advancement. In this chapter also he omits not his railing, calling us *poor deluded Wretches, &c.* with the repetition of which I will not trouble the Reader; if he be pleased, he may observe it, *pag.* 227-299. 316. 318, 319. & in several other places, but especially where he endeth the chapter, *p.* 324, 325. I needed not at all trouble the Reader with his often re-iterated accusation of my joyning with the *Papists*, since he saith I am worse and less orthodox than they in this matter, *p.* 301. 309. were it not to shew him how his malice has blinded him, for he confelleth *p.* 300. n. 8. that I condemn their *meritum ex condigno*, and placing *justification* in such works as are rather evil than good; and yet *p.* 305. he asks *wherein I differ from the worst Papists?* So then such as assert *meritum ex condigno* and these other things denied by me, are not in his sense the worst *Papists*, let him reconcile this with the general sense of *Protestants*; yea with great bitterness he quarreleth me for wronging the *Papists*, *p.* 301. calling it a *base falsehood*, and *deceit*, in me, to say *Papists do not place justification in any real inward renovation of the soul*, citing the words of the *Council of Trent* and *Bellarmin* to the contrary: but he must know, if he will, I will not be cheated by the fair words of *Papists*, contrary to what mine ears have heard, and eyes seen, to be the general practice of their people and Preachers, and that in a kingdom, where their superstition less abounds, than any place of their territories. I know they place more vertue, towards the inward renovation of the Soul, in such things as are justly condemnable, than in obedience to Christ's precepts: and were it not that he is even glad to patronize the *Papists*, that he might get some occasion to rail against me, he could not but acknowledge this, since he can not be ignorant (whatever distinctions and fair words they have invented now, to smooth their doctrine) that all the first *Reformers* do with one voice affirm, that before the Reformation, there was a profound silence of any thing, save their superstitious works, pilgrimages and indulgences, in the point of justification, not only as to making just, but even as to remission of sins, which they asserted to be attained by such means. Yet this man's charity can extend to palliat their hypocrisy, that he may accuse me, while yet in the same page, as to me, he lays aside all his charity, alledging most abusively, that it is but *good words* I give them *about the satisfaction of Christ*, and that I *deceive them with Socinian glosses, and metaphorical senses*, which is a gross calumny: like to which is his calumny, *p.* 317. where he saith,

*the Quakers talk of Christ's Sufferings and Death, &c. as all done within man.*

¶ 2 That the Reader may not be interrupted, in the thorough examination of this point, by his calumnies, perversions and malicious insinuations, which he bellows throughout most of his work to squeeze out of my words, that he may render me either odious or ridiculous; I will remove them in the first place, ere I come to the main matter. Of this kind is what he saith, p. 297. where he plays upon me, saying, *that justification is not by our work, or works, considered by themselves*; as if this were a mighty absurdity, to say, works wrought in a man could in any sense not be called his, which he reckons *Phanaticism in solio*. But if this be so, he must accuse Christ and the Apostle Paul of this *Phanaticism*, and it shall not much trouble me to be accounted guilty with them, albeit I lie under I. B's censur for it, for Christ saith to his Apostles, *Mat. 10: 20. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you.* and *Mark 13: 11. — for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost*, yet they uttered the words. He must either here confess his shame, albeit he term me a *shameless man*, for saying that Christ's words confirm it, or else condemn Christ: was not this *speaking a work* of the Apostles? and doth not Christ say, *it is not they?* and dare he call this a contradiction? So then he may see in what respect *good works*, considered otherwise than as merely the works of men, help in *justification*: see also *1 Cor. 15: 10. — But I laboured more abundantly than they all, yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me.* So here the Apostle's labour is ascribed to the *Grace*, so as he saith it was not he; and yet this man asketh, p. 248. *if to be justified by Christ within be not to be justified by our works?* adding, to render me odious, *especially seeing this is Christ formed within, and not Christ who laid down his life a ransom for sinners, which Christ, in our account, he saith, can not cleanse, nor do any good*, which is a gross calumny. But the evil he intendeth here to us returneth upon his own head, for, if to assert *Christ formed within* be to assert *another Christ*, than dyed and suffered, Then the Apostle was guilty of this crime, *Gal. 4: 19. — I travel in birth again, untill Christ be formed in you*: yea he calls *Christ within the hope of Glory*, *Col. 1: 28. Will he thence dare to say the Apostle held another Christ than he that dyed?* And let him prove, if he can, that, in our speaking of *Christ formed within*, we say more than the Apostle. Another of his calumnies, is, p. 302. where, because I say that *all have sinned* that come to man's age, therefore I deny that the wicked actions of such as are not come to be men and

women are sin; which is utterly false, as I never said so, so I never intended, as he maliciously affirms, to insinuat any such thing. Pag. 303, 304. he would screw my words speaking of a *twofold Redemption*, whereof the first is the capacity of being redeemed, purchased by Christ without, and the receiving of and enjoying that wrought by Christ in us; to make an absurdity, because I say that as to us they can not be separated, *then all must be redeemed the one way, who are redeemed the other*, and that then every man must be redeemed from the power of corruption, and saved. But here, according to his custom, he cites not my words justly, which are, *that they are both perfect in their own nature, albeit in their application to us ward they can not be separated*, that is, he, that comes effectually to enjoy the benefit of the one, must enjoy the other; he, that receives the second, partakes of the first also; he, that really receives the first, receives the second also: but that hinders not but many may be offered the benefit of the first, and by rejecting and resisting it lose the benefit both of first and second; and he, that rejecteth it at any time, albeit he receive it for a season, as by his falling he loses what of the second is wrought in him, to wit, of *purification*, so he doth also lose the first, which was *remission of sin*. His last cavill at this is very impertinent, which is by way of question, *that if this second redemption be necessary to salvation*, as it indeed is, *what shall become of the child of God, that hath no light? what shall become of them that have true grace uniting them to Christ, &c. and yet through darkness can see and acknowledge no such thing?* For to pass-by the absurditys here supposed, that saints can be said to have no light, or have grace, and be united to Christ, yet neither be able to see it nor acknowledge it, and that not during their life-time here; for unless this be also supposed, he can not conclude what he will, for that a saint may be clouded at a time is not denied, yet this maketh nothing for his purpose. Will it follow, because they see it not, that it therefore is not needfull to their Salvation? His own words imply a contradiction to this. And thus the man confutes that by which he would urge another, in the very words by which he expresses it, *for is not grace to unite the heart to Christ necessary to Salvation?* He will surely say Yes: if then the acknowledgment of that, and seing of it, which is needfull to salvation, be not needfull, then the not seing or not acknowledging of a thing makes it not a thing unnecessary to Salvation, which is the absurdity he would insinuat.

¶ 3. Thus having removed out of the way his most obvious perversions and abuses, I come to treat of the main matter, which all depends upon this one question *What is that whereby a man is justified, so as to appear truly just, in the sight of God?* This he supposes to be done by the righteousness and death of Christ without, even before any work of righteousness be wrought in man, even as a cautioner, to whom he compares Christ in this case, frees him, whose debt he pays. 1, on the contrary, affirm, that, albeit reconciliation and remission of sins be by the death of Christ without, and the door opened, so that all may be at peace, by the offer of grace, made in Christ, if they reject it not, yet hereby no man can be said to be justified, or appear just, properly, untill Christ be received in his heart, there to renew and purifie him, and make him just, so that, however justification may be distinguished from sanctification, yet not divided, nor yet so distinguished, that a man can be truly said to be justified, who is unholy and unsanctified. And there fore upon the examining of what he urges against this, and for his position, as also what he answers to my probations for it, depends the whole matter; but before I enter particularly upon this, and that there may no interruption meet me, when entred in it, I will first take notice, and remove his mistakes and misapplied proofs thereupon, both in what he opposes me, and affirms for himself, as also here take notice of his meer assertions. And first then, pag. 299. he supposes there can be no reconciliation by the blood of Christ's cross, &c. unless for such, in whose room Christ dyed, as a Cautioner and Surety, and so made satisfaction, that they should be redeemed and delivered. But, albeit upon this notion and affirmation all depends, yet I miss the proof of it; if his after proofs say any thing to it, I shall examin them: that which he mentions here written Rom. 8: 3, 4. is so far from doing it, that it proves the contrary. For albeit the Death of Christ was, that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, yet it follows not that the righteousness of the Law must be fulfilled in all, for whom he dyed: yea the following words — *who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit*, shew this to be the condition requisite on our part, that we may partake of the benefit of his Death. If, to prove that man should be reconciled, redeemed and delivered by the Death of Christ, he bring the instances of the righteousness of the Law to be fulfilled in us; then men can not be said to be reconciled, redeemed and delivered, untill this righteousness of the Law be fulfilled in them. What he addeth to this, *that we can not be said to be accounted righteous, and absolved from Accusation, upon the account* of



of our works of righteousness, since I say no such thing, freely confessing that not only pardoning of sin, but removing of the filth, as well as of the guilt, is the act of God's Mercy, and Grace, as saith the Apostle, Tit. 3 : 5, 6. and yet we are saved, and consequently justified, according to his Mercy, by the *washing of Regeneration*, since this is the fruit of the Grace and spirit of God freely given us. And therefore it is not enough for him, pag. 302. to affirm that I pervert the Apostle's words, 2 Cor. 5 : 19, 20. --- *God was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself*, upon this bare supposition, that this [World] is only understood of the *Elect*: for, if this reconciliation had been absolute, and not in part only, that is, a readyness on God's part to be reconciled with them, if they repent, which I affirm; to what purpose should the Apostle, as an *Embassador* intreat them to be reconciled? there needed no intreaty to that which was already done; neither are his meer assertions to this, p. 303. any answer. It is strange, that to prove that all, for whom Christ dyed, are certainly made alive one time or other, he brings these words *And that he dyed for all, that they which live, should not hence forth live unto themselves, but unto him, which dyed for them, &c.* for he doth not say here, that all he dyed for are made alive, but that they that are made alive should so live; neither doth the saying *Christ has born the sins of all in his own body on the tree* import any being actually freed of the guilt of sin, untill they receive the condition as above, *be ye therefore reconciled unto God*. But he overturns what he earnestly pleaded for before, p. 310. n. 23. where he saith, *they owne not that reconciliation was so perfected by Christ on earth, that there is nothing to be done by man, in order to his actual justification*: if so, then no man is actually justified, untill something be done by him, and this doing imports a work, so here a work of man is necessary for justification; and this is rather more than I say. And if something be to be done on man's part, ere actual justification be obtained, then that which is done by Christ before, must be only a potential justification, and what is this more than a capacity of being justified? which yet he batters against in me, and yet he must confess this to distinguish himself from the *Antinomians*, whose opinions albeit he divers times disclaims, yet he shews not how he can liberat himself from it: and therefore in contradiction to what is here observed, both his assertions and proofs resolve in the *Antinomian* doctrine, and concludes for it, as much as for him, which I might therefore pass all, as impertinent. But for instance, his great ex-

ample of a *Cautioner* or *Surety*, used often, as pag. 299. 310, 311. for when a *Cautioner* pays a man's debt for him, so soon as he lays down the money, which is a sufficient intimation to him, to whom the debt is due, the person, for whom it is paid, is really acquitted, albeit he have done no act, yea know not of it; and this, as I observed before, himself acknowledgeth, in the application, saying, p. 304. that *some, who are united to Christ by Grace*, (and surely such are justified) *can neither see it, nor acknowledge it*. So then, if this example of his *Surety* hold true, men are justified, before they believe, as say the *Antinomians*; and therefore all the Scriptures, brought by him, p. 308. to prove that *Christ made a proper, real and full satisfaction, in the behalf of men*, will conclude for the *Antinomians* as much as for him: whereas p. 314. he looks upon it as a calumny to say they speak not of a *real justification*, for he concludes, p. 312. that *imputative justification is real*. He argues for the *Antinomians* also, since he accounts this imputation to be only of righteousness wrought without men by Christ in his own person; for, if by this imputation men be really justified, then they are as much or at least as really justified before they believe, as after, since faith is an act of man's will, and no such thing according to him can have place in Justification: and yet, to go round, he saith, p. 308. that they say not, that *God justifieth any remaining in their sins*. But do they not say so, since taking his opinion the safest way, and furthest from *Antinomians*, he concludeth a man justified in the act of conversion? and such he supposes to have been great sinners, yea and that they may not be purged from them many years after; yea and how can they, if they must sin daily, as they say, in *thought, word and deed*? (of which more hereafter) are not such then remaining in their sins according to them justified? Pag. 306. N. 16. he would infer a contradiction upon me, from saying, *good works are necessary as causa sine qua non*, for this he saith contradicts my saying *We are justified by the inward birth, and not by our works*, seeing works being but the consequence of that birth, is but the effect, even a *causa sine qua non* must be before the effect; on which he also insists, p. 319. n. 38. But this contradiction is founded upon the supposition, that this birth is brought forth without good works; which I deny, seeing regeneration is a work of the Spirit in us, by which we are justified, that is, really made just, and the works, which proceed therefrom, are but a consequence of it. And now as to his proofs, and also his examining of mine, they are inserted, pag. 204. n. 13. where he saith, that the re-

dem-

## Sect. VIII.

## Of Justification.

III

*redemption of Christ is a far other thing, and hath far other effects, than to make men capable of salvation, even remission of sins. But I never denied, but that it brought remission of sins to such as embrace and receive it, neither do the Scriptures cited by him prove more, 2 Cor. 5: 19. Dan. 9: 24-26. Col. 1: 19, 20. Ephes. 1: 11-15. Job. 17: 2. Heb. 9: 12, 13. 2 Cor. 1: 20. none of which speak of the reconciliation made by Christ to be in it self more than procuring a capacity of Salvation, other ways than as received and laid hold-on by believers; and when it is spoken of, with respect to such, I never denied but it was more, for the capacity is brought unto action: he addeth, the very texts cited by my self make against me, Eph. 2: 15. he dyed to make in himself of us one new man, so making peace: ver. 13. but now in Christ Jesus, ye who sometimes were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ, asking, was this only a capacity of coming near? but the Apostle here speaks of those, who had received, and not resisted, the benefit of that capacity. And whereas he saith 1 Job. 4: 10. the Son of God's being said to be a propitiation for our sins, is more than a meer possibility of friendship. But doth not the same Apostle say, he is a propitiation for the whole World? yet he did not actually reconcile the whole world, save in a capacity. Ezech. 16: 6. he giveth a question, in stead of answer, 1 Pet. 2: 24. Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness, by whose stripes ye were healed. noting 1 Pet. 3: 18. Christ hath once suffered, that he might bring us to God, but it saith not, that Christ by his sufferings did bring us to God, which would have more made for his purpose; and though it had been so, yet neither that nor what is above cited prove any thing, being spoken to those, who had received the second redemption, as well as the first. Then he notes these following, Col. 1: 14. Gal. 1: 4. 3: 13, 14. 4: 5. Rev. 5: 9, 10. & 14: 3, 4. Tit. 2: 13. all which I have looked, but find not that they prove what he intends: some were spoken not only to those who had already received the benefit of Christ's death here, but of such as were already glorified in heaven; if he think they will prove his matter, he must shew how, the next time he writes.*

¶ 4. Pag. 309. n. 21. He brings my argument shewing that where there is a perfect reconciliation, there there is no separation. why doth God then so often complain of his People for their sins? from this it would follow that sin made no separation, or that their good works and worst sins are the same, in God's account, His answer to this, is, *that a*

man

man may be in a justified state and declared just, because constituted so, albeit unrighteous as to his person, because of his unrighteous actions, in which sense he is not justified nor approved of God, that is, in plain Scots, to say, God constituteth and declareth men just, albeit they be wicked men, and really unjust, the first being underitood of their condition, the second of their person: but the misery is, there wants something to knit this incoherent matter together, and inform us how a man, as to his condition, is just, while in his person unjust; and indeed he brings no proof for all this. And albeit I wonder not at this omission, since he could do no better, yet I desire he may let me know the next time, why I should receive his answer without proof. That every sin, which may be committed by a Saint, doth not unfaint him, or destroy his condition, I acknowledge; but they suppose no sin to do it, for when they affirm murder and adultery and treachery not to have done it, (as they do) if these sins are not destructive and killing as to man's condition, I know none; and desire to be informed how by Scriptur it can be made appear that these do not: so my argument still remains in force, and his charge of *Antinomianism* against me falleth to the ground. Pag. 311. He brings my argument shewing the absurdity of their objection from 2 Cor. 5: 21. thus, *If we be just, as Christ was a sinner, by imputation, then as there was not the least sin in Christ, so there is no necessity for the least righteousness in us.* To which he answers, *neither is there to our being justified upon that account.* The Reader may judge of this doctrine, which the man, either forgetting, or being ashamed of, plainly contradicts in the same page, saying, *that sanctification is inseparably joyned with justification; for then sure righteousness must be necessary to be justified upon whatever account.* And yet to go round again, within five lines he cites *Joh. 6: 29. & 9: 35, 36. & 10: 38. & 12: 36. & 14: 1. & 16: 9.* to prove that Christ would have people resting upon a righteousness merely imputative, for justification, for that is the thing denied by me; for, if sanctification be unseparable from justification, it is impossible to rest upon that, which is merely imputative. That these Scriptures prove no such thing, the Reader may see, all of them press believing in Christ, but that to believe in Christ is to rest upon a righteousness merely imputative, remains yet for him to prove. But to proceed, with an unparalleled confidence to answer to me saying, that to my observation that sentence, *the imputed righteousness of Christ*, which they so much urge, as the foundation of their faith, is not to be found in all the Scriptur, he noteth divers places of Scriptur, in not

one of which there is any such thing; and indeed this controversy, being of matter of fact, can be easily decided by any that can read, who can easily see whether that expression be there or not: for the question is of the expression *in terminis*, not of what he apprehendeth may by consequence import the like. What he saith in answer to my proving *justifying* to be understood of being *really made just*, from 1 Cor. 6: 11. he overturneth himself in a few lines, confessing that the *Corinthians* were *really changed*, and if so, we need not doubt where it is said *they were justified*, but they were *really made just*, that is, *changed* from *unrighteousness*, as he confesseth they were.

¶ 5. Pag. 312. n. 26. He cometh to take notice of what I urge from the word *justification*, and from the etymology of it, and having introduced himself with a scoff he saith, *I do place this upon the authority of the vulgar Latine edition*; but therein he is mistaken, the Greek word *δικαιωσις* will make as much for my purpose, as the Latine: he passeth from the etymology, p. 313. and saith *the words usually import a juridical absolution by the sentence of a Judge*. but what then? is not that because Judges usually at least absolve men upon the account of their innocency. And so his comparison of a *Surety* will not here hit, for when men are accused of murder or adultery, or theft, and that the case is proven and confessed, what Judges use to declare the person acquitted upon *Surety* given by another innocent person? And therefore *justifico*, *I justify*, signifies the declaring of one *just*, who is so; and though *justifico*, as being sometimes taken in a Law sense, doth not, in the Indicative, answer to *sanctifico*, because it is there *active*, and has relation to another person; yet in the *Passive*, when relating to the person *sanctified*, it is understood one way, for *justificatus* and *sanctificatus* signifie the same. But he overturneth all his quibbling here, p. 313. n. 27. by asking, whether they say, *that a man is said to be justified, who is not really just*? which imports they say not so, and then we are agreed, only I would ask him how a man is really just, while committing a *actual wickedness* and *unrighteousness* as to his person? and yet he said before, such were justified, and yet in the next, p. 314. he saith, *I maliciously calumniate them, to say, they make use of the figurative sense of the word*: let the Reader judge of these consistencies. And whereas I cite some Scriptures, that *justifying* is spoken of some, who arrogate *righteousness* to themselves, though it do not belong to them, and at these he carpeth, saying, *the very first*, Exod. 23: 7. *is spoken of God of himself*, he

should have said, it is God speaking of the *wicked*, that he will not justify them: *some of them speak of a not justifying*, Job. 9: 20. & 27: 5. and what then? the places were marked, to shew the import of the word *justify*, and to shew that many of them speak nothing of *justifying* at all, whence he concludes in these words, *So unhappy is the man in his citations*. He notes first *Esai 5: 23* but it seems he has been in haste, and therefore to rectifie his mistake, let him read the words, which are, *which justify the wicked for reward*: and what, though, where many Scriptures are noted together, by the mistake of the transcriber or Printer the figures may be misplaced, and so mis? Truly they must be very happy, that can secure themselves from this hazard; he has not been so happy, who denied the words to be in a place, where the knowing of it depended not upon the diligence of others, but of his own looking to it, as I have just now shewn. Pag. 315. to prove that *justified* is not taken in the epistles of the Apostle Paul to the *Rom. Corinths Gal.* for making *just*, as I affirmed in the passages cited by me, he saith, *to take it so would make the Apostle contradict himself*. But this he affirms upon the meer supposition that the Apostle with him excludes all *works* from *Justification*, which is but to beg the question, as will after appear. What he adds here, and in the following page, in answer to the citations I bring out of divers Protestant Authors, I need not trouble the Reader with a reply to it, because he turns by the most material of them, as not having the *Authors* by him, to examine them; others he positively rejects, as not agreeing with them, as *Forbes* and *Baxter*, and at last insinuates that the trial is not to be by *humane Testimonies*, for such he accounts all the writings of his Brethren, whereunto I do very well agree: only I brought some of his own folks, not as if I needed them to confirm me in my opinion, but as having weight with those among whom they are esteemed *Doctors*. In this page answering what I urge from *Rom. 8: 30*. shewing how in that golden chain *sanctification* must be excluded, or *justification* must be taken in its proper sense; he saith, that *sanctification is comprehended under Vocation*. If this be true which he asserts, then he gives again away his cause, for then no man is sooner called than he is sanctified; and since he will not say (seeing he disclaims to be an *Antinomian*) that any man is *justified*, before he be called, it follows then necessarily that no man is *justified* before he be *sanctified*, and then to what purpose has he been fighting and wrestling all this while? Pag. 316: n. 33. he accuses me of *unparalleled falsehood, impudency* and



and boldness, for saying that I have sufficiently proven that by [justification] ought to be understood [to be made really just] whereas I undertook only to prove that the word might be so understood without absurdity; adding, I wonderfully conclude a *must be* from a *may be*, &c. but the best is, his greatest charges are built either upon forged calumnies, or his own pityfull mistakes. I never concluded by [justification] ought to be understood [to be made really just only] upon that which I said from the etymology of the word, nor by [justification] there did I understand meerly the word, but I conclude from all my Scriptur arguments of the thing, as my following words manifest, where I say We know it from sensible experience, but he may be sure it is not the etymology of the word, we know so. And if thence he urge that this falleth not under the inward sensation of the Soul, he but fights with his own mistake, for that the *real justification* of the *Saints* falleth under the *inward sensation* of the *Soul*, I think no man of sense will deny; for Christ is formed in the mind, where he is said to be revealed inwardly, and that gives a sense of *justification*, albeit he seem to wonder at it, asking, *what Scriptur speaketh so?* he may read Gal. 1: 16. Whether was not the Apostle here justified, and under the sense of it? He is angry, p. 3 17. that I call the *life of Christ* an *inward and spiritual thing*, but will he say it is an outward and carnal thing? But what thinks he of 2 Cor. 4: 10, 11.? He confesseth *this Life of Christ supported and carryed the persecuted Apostles through many miseries and deaths*, will he say then it was not an inward and spiritual thing that carryed them through these trials? But he addeth, *But who, except a Quaker, could say, that the Apostle sayes, we are justified by this life?* I answer: all, except such absurd men as will deny that where we are said to be *saved* by a thing, we are said to be *justified* by it, Rom. 5: 10. Tit. 3: 5. we are said to be *saved by regeneration*. And whereas he saith *the Apostle saith not that this is the Formal Objective Cause of Justification*; these are words the Apostle useth not at all, and therefore no wonder there be no word of it here. He looks upon it as being absurd for me to think that *Reprobation* is *Non-Justification*, but I would know of him if there be any Reprobats who are justified. That the *marks and evidences* are not always taken from the *Immediat, Nearest, and Formal Cause*, I confess, but that therefore the not having Christ revealed in the Soul, is only a sign, and no cause of Reprobation, remains for him to prove: *wickedness* is a *signe of Reprobation*, will he therefore affirm it is not the *Immediat nor Formal Cause* of

it? After the same manner he denieth, p. 319. that we must lean to that which the Apostle calleth (Col. 1:27, 28.) *Christ within the hope of Glory*; his reason is, because the Apostle saith, Phil. 1:28. *And in nothing terrified by your adversaries, which is — to you an evident token of salvation, asking, must we also lean to that in Justification?* But will he say there is no difference betwixt that which is only a token and *Christ within*? If there be, his reason concludes nothing.

¶ 6. Lastly: he comes to answer what I say of the necessity of good works to Justification; and what I urge from *Isai. 2.* he confesseth that *Good Works* are an *Instrumental cause*, which concession doth prove all I affirm; if they be an instrumental cause, they must be a cause *sine qua non*, and necessary, since the instrumental cause of a thing must be necessary towards its being. What? though *Abraham* was justified, before he offer'd up his son, it will not follow that he was justified without works. His absurdity, as if it would thence follow, that *no man is justified when he sleeps, or is not actually doing some work*, looks liker the objection of a man sleeping, who knows not what he saith, than of one awake, for by the same way it might be said, that *Faith* is not necessary, since men do no more actually believe, than *do good works*, when they are sleeping. My argument deduced from *Heb. 12:14. Matth. 7:21. John 13:17. 1 Cor. 7:19. Revel. 22:14.* he sayes, proves the necessity of Works unto final Salvation, but not to Justification, and if it do so, it doth the business, unless he will say, that full and perfect justification is not sufficient to Salvation. My answer to their first objection he observs, but replies not: to the second, answering what they urge from *Rom. 3:20.* --- *by the deeds of the Law, there shall no flesh be justified*, which I shew, is to be understood of works don and not by the Grace of God, he answers, that such are no good works at all. But may not a man do some of the works, which even the Moral Law commands, such as not to committ murder, theft, or adultery, without the Grace of God? Hath not he confessed as much of some *Heathens*, whom he judgeth not to have had the Grace of God? and will he say, these works are not materially good, albeit not formally, with a respect to any advantage, as to Salvation, they receive by them? And though it should be confessed, that all is not always requisite to be antecedent to justification, which falls out to be antecedent to Salvation; yet the question is Whether there be any thing absolutely requisite to be antecedent to salvation, which is not also absolutely requisite to be antecedent

to justification? If not, then if works be absolutely necessary, or so far as they are absolutely necessary to Salvation, they must also be so to justification. If he say other ways, then (as I observed before) full and perfect justification, according to him, must not be esteemed sufficient to Salvation. Pag 322. n. 42. He comes to prove the *best works*, even those wrought by the Spirit in the Saints, to be *impure*, which before also he had affirmed, pag 307. there he would infer we say the same of *good works*, because I affirm *that works done by man's own strength are polluted*, but it will not thence follow we believe Works done by the Grace of God to be such. But for this impurity of *good works* he marks *Psal. 143: 2. 130: 3. Job 9: 16.* none of which speak one word of *good works* thus understood; then he mentions *Eesai 64: 6* *all our righteousness is as filthy rags*, but silently passeth over how I shew their own Authors, as *Calvin* and *Musculus, &c.* affirm this not to be understood of *Evangelical righteousness*, and himself overturns what he urges from this, affirming, *that we ought not to call the work of the Spirit of God in his People, filthy rags*, but if they were so, they might be so called; and yet he overturns it further, by confessing *some works wrought by the Apostles were undefiled*, then all the works wrought by the Spirit in the Saints can not be said to be impure, which is their assertion. And the instance of *clean water* passing through an *unclean pipe* doth not hold, which is their great probation. He will not contend with what I say about the word *Merit*, neither hath he much against my conclusion in this matter, yet that he may end this chapter like himself, he concludeth it with a gross lye, and railing, saying, I affirm *a man may be regenerated without the least help of the Grace of God*, which as I wholly abhor, so there can not be a greater falshood alledged upon me.

## Section. Ninth,

Wherein his Fourteenth Chapter Of *PERFECTION* is considered.

¶ 1. I come now to his XIV. Chapter *Of Perfection*, where, after he has repeated my eighth *Proposition*, he reckons it *confidence* in me, to accuse their answer in their larger Catechism, of speaking against the *power of Divine Grace*, which saith, *that man is not able by any Grace of God, received in this life, to keep the commands of*

God. But in stead of justifying this assertion, he saith, *they are not ashamed of it*, then he recurrerh a little to his Author *Hicky*, according to his custom, and falls a railing, where, among other great charges, he accuseth the *Quakers* of *Reproaching*, *Reviling*, *Calumnies*, *Scolding*, and the like, also pag. 329. speaking of *bridling the tongue*. But he of all men should have been silent in this, who is such a *Railer* in the Superlative degree, that some of his own faith, who have bad enough thoughts of the *Quakers*, have said, that he not only equals them, but exceeds them in railing: of his *Railing* in this chapter the Reader may further observe, pag. 332: 345-349. Here, as in his former chapter, to enervat the perfection asserted by me, he brings forth his old and often repeated Calumny, as if I asserted *this perfection to proceed meerly from the Light of Nature*, affirming the *Light* pleaded for by me, p. 327. to be such as *never came from the Grace of God*, to be *flesh*, *blindness*, *enmity to God*, *natural*, *sensual*, &c. affirming that I say Man is regenerated, sanctified, justified, *though not one ray of Divine Illumination hath shined into his Soul, nor one act of Grace has reached either his intellectu, will or affection*, to cause this change: the like p. 331. all which is most abominably false, and never either believed or asserted by me, and therefore all he concludes upon this malicious assertion falls to the ground, and needs no further answer. Next, he bestows much pains p. 328, 329. to shew, from the Hebrew and Greek word, that *perfection* is sometimes understood of *sincerity* and *integrity*; and *Perfection* in these respects he thus defines, *in regeneration the whole man is changed*, so that he is *now born a new creatur, sanctified wholly in mind, heart, spirit, affections, Conscience, memory and body*, though but in a small measur or degree, and again, *yeelding impartial obedience, through the Grace of God, unto all God's precepts, waving none*. But if he will stand by what he here asserts, I will desire no more, albeit he fallly say, in the following page, *that all this will not satisfie us*, for I would desire the next time he would reconcile this with *breaking the commands daily in thought, word, and deed*. To prove this he insists, (in contradiction to what he said before) p. 330. n. 7. and his proofs are (1.) *because in Christ's house there are diverse syzes, and degrees of persons*, as *babes*, or *little children*, *young men*, *old men*: and this is not denied, but the thing he should have proved is, that none of those degrees can be without *daily breaking God's commands*. His second proof is yet more rare, *Christians are exhorted to grow in Grace, to put-off the old man, which is corrupt, to put-on the New Man, to mortifie their members*. Very good:

good: But is *to break the commands daily in thought, word and deed*, the way to grow in Grace, to put off the old man, and on the New? if this be not to pervert Christianity, what can be said to be so? If men can dream waking, as he sometimes suppoles, he has sure been in this postur, when he brought this proof. But he adds, *that this Perfection rendreth Gospel commands useles*; but are the Laws useles, if men obey them? *This*, saith he, *takes away the exercise of Repentance, the exercise of Prayer, and maketh the petitions of the Lord's Prayer useles*, [*forgive our sins*] on this he also insilteth, pag. 345, 346-349. That, because all have sinned, they have need to repent, and pray for forgiveness, and the continuance of it, I have shewn in my Apology: but if this his argument hold true, to prove that men must sin all their life-time, and break the commands every day, in thought, word, and deed, then the greatest sinners and most wicked profligate villains do les make useles Gospel commands than others, because they afford more matter to exercise Repentance and Prayer, for forgiveness of sins. But he proceedeth, *that this tendeth to foment Pride and Security, and taketh-away diligent watchfulness, and holy fear, humility, and the usefulness of the Ordinances of Christ*: but where freedom from sin is, where can pride and security have place, or diligence and humility be wanting? But with him, *to sin* is the way *not* to be proud and secure, but to be watchfull and humble. Let the judicious Reader judge, whether they, that break the commands *daily, in thought, word, and deed*, and affirm they must do so *all their life-time*, be more diligent and humble, and les proud and secure, than such as keep and obey them: for such Ordinances, as must be made usefull *by daily breaking God's commands, in thought, word, and deed*, I resolve never to cry-up, but always cry-down, by the Grace of God, however I. B. may rail at me for it. Some Scriptures here added by him will come hereafter to be examined.

¶ 2. Pag 332. N 9. When he comes to take notice of my stating this matter, as not being such a *Perfection* as can not admit of a daily encrease, but only a being kept from sin, and receiving strength to fulfill the will of God; (for these are my words) he would upon this, both in this place and elsewhere, pag. 333. 341, &c urge this absurdity, *that, since the least sin is a transgression of the Law, it follows, that no regenerated man can sin, and that no man, that sinneth is regenerated*: but we will not wonder at his inference here, considering his many other perversions. But to shew he has no ground to urge this absurdity, let it be considered, that we

are

are to consider *Regeneration* as begun and carrying on, and as perfected and accomplished; — *he which hath begun a good work in you*, saith the Apostle Paul, *Phil. 1: 6*. And again, *Ye did run well*, *Gal. 5: 7*. with many other places, which might be mentioned. Whereby it is clear, that *Regeneration* is not wrought in an instant, (and if he think so, he must prove it, ere he conclude any thing from it) and those were already converted, and regeneration begun in them. Now albeit such may sin, and that every sin doth hinder and impede the work of *Regeneration*, yet it doth not destroy it, nor wholly annihilat it: Physik given to a man, in whom there is an inward and inveterat disease, doth not cure instantly; and albeit by some heedless actions he may hinder the cure from being perfected, so soon, yet every one of these actions do not render it altogether unsuccessful. Also as to the comparison of a *child*, which he accepts of, albeit he have all the *integral* parts of a man, yet he has not that vigor and strength of body, nor yet that understanding nor exercise of mind, that a man hath, and thence can neither defend himself, nor do either in body or mind, that a man can do. Now what I speak of such as are born of God, saying, that I dare not affirm but there may be some that can not sin, I understand of this absolute, compleat, and full regeneration; not that I deny but such as are entred and in part regenerated may be also said to be born of God, though not in that absolute sense, and therefore still under the possibility of sinning, and capacity thereunto. And thus his great absurdity, upon which he insists so much, is removed. Next he proceeds, *p. 334*. to shew my agreement with the *Pelagians*, but the very citation he brings to prove it out of *Vossius* history bewrays his weakness, and shews the contrary, where it is manifest, that the thing condemned in *Pelagius* was his affirming *men might keep the commands, by the power of Nature*, which I never said, but always denied. And whereas he cites the *Fathers* saying, *that none by the strength of Grace did live all their days without sin*, that the perfection ascribed to some in Scripture was not from Nature, but from Grace, &c. this clearly shews they believed men might be free from sin by Grace, sometime, though none had been so for all their life-time, which shews they were far from believing *man must break the commands daily, in thought, word, and deed*, which is his affirmation. What he adds of the *Fathers* arguments against the *Pelagians*, and of the opinions of the *Socinians*, and others, in this matter, I judge it not my work, to meddle with it; I heed not in this what these *Sects* say,



I say, but believe the Truth (without respect to them) as it is clearly proposed in Scriptur. I could easily recriminate, by shewing things, wherein he agrees with *Papists, Socinians, Arminians, Antinomians, Pelagians, Anabaptists* and others, against us, if I judged it pertinent to be filling-up paper with such stuff, to make a noise, as he doth hundreds of times, to nauseating: but I love to abstain from such superfluities, and come to the purpose, and will now consider what he saith in answer to my arguments..

¶ 3. He begins *pag. 337. n. 18.* and to my saying, their doctrine is against the Wisdom of God, *who is of purer eyes, than he can behold iniquity*, he asketh *Is it against these attributes of God, that sin should be in the world?* But my following words shew I spake of the Godly, neither will it follow what he adds after *that then they must be as free of sin here, as in heaven, and that at first*; for I urge it to be contrary to God's Wisdom, to make this freedom impossible unto them only, means for their being free being given them, & not his permitting sin. And whereas he proceeds in answer to my saying, that, if man be always joyned to sin, he should be always disjoyned from God, according to *Esai 59: 2.* Whereas, on the contrary, they, to wit, the *Saints*, are said to be partakers of the *Divine Nature*, *2 Pet. 1: 4.* and *one Spirit* with him, *1 Cor. 6: 17.* he answers, *All this would plead for a sinlesness, from the very first instant of Regeneration.* In the absolute sense above mentioned it doth, as also for the necessity of pressing after, and for the possibility of obtaining it, after Regeneration begun, since so far as man is joyned to sin, his perfect regeneration is retarded; yet, as himself, towards the end of this Paragraph saith, *it may be begun, where some members may yet be to be mortified*: and albeit some corruption be not wholly purged-out, yet God can have fellowship with his own work of Grace in the Soul, and with the Soul, so far as it is sanctified and renewed, but no further. *Pag. 339. n. 19.* he saith, *I wickedly dispute for God, &c.* to say it is against his Wisdom not to have found means, whereby he might be served, but by such actions by which the Devil is no less, yea is more, served. But his charge is upon the naked supposition that their doctrine is the Truth, which is pittingly to beg the question, yea he indirectly (notwithstanding much winding about, to avoid it) confesseth my charge, saying, *there is no formal service performed to the Devil*: so he grants some *material* service to be performed to him. Is not the Devil served, and that service justly displeasing to

Q

God,

God, unless it be a formal service; for to serve the Devil formally, is to acknowledge him as their Master, and give him service as due to him, which many do not, who yet may be said truly enough to serve him. He addeth, *that God hath seen meet his children be in a spiritual warfare.* What then? can no man be in a warfare, unless he be overcome? Men may be engaged in warr, and may be liable to be assaulted, yea may be often-times narrowed, straitned, and beset by the Enemy, and sometimes wounded, and yet never overcome: but what he pleads for, is not only a warfare, but a being worsted, and overcome, and that every day; for so truly are such overcome by the Devil, *who daily break the commandments of God, in thought, word and deed*, as he affirms of all God's children. He goes on, n. 20. to say, *I run my self blind, in saying, it is against God's justice to require men to abstain from all sin, and not enable them to do it*, because it would prove all the wicked are perfect, for God requires of them obedience. But it seems himself has been blind, when he made this answer; I never urged, that, because God gave men power, therefore they are perfect, as he foolishly throughout this paragraph imagineth, and then battereth against this man of straw of his own making: and that this proves that wicked men might, if they had not resisted God's Grace, have forsaken their wickedness, and been perfect, I deny not, neither doth he prove the contrary. He confesseth man's imperfection to be of themselves, but he thinks it can not be accounted unrighteousness in God, to require, and yet not to give that measure of Grace, whereby men should become perfect, because that power, which was once given, was sinfully cast-away. But all this dependeth upon the supposition that man lost his power in Adam, which was before difficult, and is now in him but a begging of the question. And when I shew that their doctrine maketh God more unjust than the vilest of men, who will not give to their children, asking bread, a stone, &c. he reproacheth me, as a *blasphemous tongue*. But let us see how he frees their doctrine of this foul consequence: *the Lord forbid*, saith he, *they hope for a full deliverance, but it is in heaven.* This answer confirmeth the charge, and doth not lessen it, and so, for all his bragg, the stone yet remains, according to them, instead of bread, and is like to choak him, unless he find some better way to digest it than thus; for God requires to forsake sin here, and yet (according to them) denies the power here, for concerning being free from sin in heaven, there is no question. He addeth,

pag. 341. that my saying *their doctrine is injurious to the sacrifice of Christ's Death*, which was, *to take-away sin*, destroys all I said of *Universal Redemption*: but he forgets to shew how, perhaps we may expect it next, since his 8 chapter is already answered. His saying they affirm *that the stain of sin is taken-away, and victory obtained*, doth not answer, because they refer that to another life, and the question is concerning this. And to my saying, that, if the children of God sin in thought, word, and deed daily, then there is no difference betwixt the Holy and Profane, he answereth, *the difference is great, because what the Wicked do, is done with full purpose of heart, &c. but the other mourneth over and repenteth of his sin*. This difference is in respect of *Repentance*, not of *sinning*, in their sinning they are both alike. That there is a difference betwixt him, that continueth in sin, and him that repenteth, I deny not; but since he supposes the godly to continue in sin, all their life-time, yea in daily sinning, the similitude still remaineth, and such will do wel to take heed, *who break God's commands daily in thought, word, and deed*, lest notwithstanding they may be in I. B.'s account the godly, yet in Jesus Christ's they prove such to whom it shall be said, *Depart ye workers of iniquity, I know you not*.

¶ 4. Pag. 343. N. 23. In stead of answering my argument shewing their doctrine maketh the work of the Ministry, Preaching and Praying usefess, he saith, *Hence we see the necessity of a standing Ministry, which I am against*: this is false, as shall appear. He adds, *The Ministry is to bring them on toward perfection*; but the question is Whether that Perfection is not attainable here? For a Perfection, that admitteth not of a growth, I plead not. If he would have had this answer understood to be to the purpose, he should have said, that such as sin not, can not be said to admit of a growth, which he doth not so much as attempt, nor offer to prove. What I affirm to the contrary, in the example of Christ, who, notwithstanding he was always free of sin, is said to *increase both in favour with God and man*, *Luk. 2: 52.* to this mentioned in my Apology (notwithstanding his prolixity) he is as mute as a fish. How their doctrine makes Prayers usefess, I have shewn before. In stead of answering *Col. 4: 12.* where *Epaphras* is said to *labour fervently in prayers, that the Colossians might stand perfect, and compleat in all the will of God.* and to *1 Thess 3: 12, 13.* where *Paul* prays that *the Lord would make them increase and abound in love, &c. To the end he might establish their hearts unblameable in holiness*: I say, in stead of answering, he makes commentaries upon these places,

(which in themselves are as plain as can be) that this is, *they should walk in sincerity, and always be growing.* And what if all this be granted? it will not follow that it is impossible men should be free of sin here, even by the Grace of God. And sure where men are perfect and compleat in all the will of God, and unblameable in holiness, *they are not sinning daily in thought, word and deed.* Thus the Reader may judge of this man's confidence, who saith these Scriptures make against this imagined Perfection, meaning that which is asserted by me. Pag. 343. He saith, my affirming Men are called justified, or reprobated, in respect of their being leavened with sin, or righteousness, (*fermenting* is a piece of his own pedantry, and none of the *Quakers* dialect) *would prove full Perfection to be essential to the state of Christianity:* therefore I must answer it, as well as they, who deny that to be common to all the *Regenerat.* But it seems he has not well understood his own new-coined English word [*fermenting*] for one thing is not said to be leavened with another, but where it hath much prevailed: every touch or tast of a thing doth not leaven him with it, that so toucheth or tasteth it; as all men, that understand common language, know: and so every sin is not enough to denominate a man leavened with sin; And so with his own answer, that follows, he looseth the knot he imagined I was tied by. What he adds afterward of fulfilling the Law, urges nothing but upon a supposition of its being fulfilled by the meer strength of man, which I never affirmed. That no man is called *just*, because of inward righteousness, is but his bare supposition: as for the word *inherent*, so often repeated by him, it is none of mine. And to my urging that the *subject* is denominated from the *accident* he saith, *yet that a wall is called white, though the whiteness be not perfect.* But it is not called white, if it be more black, than white, which was the pinch I urged, but slyly over-slipt by him; and such must be those, that break the commands daily, for how such can be said to be more just, than sinfull, is more than I can reconcile either with Scriptur or Reason: sure the answer, which he gives, doth it not. To this question, *Where are then the children of God, and of Light?* his reply is with a notable piece of inconsistent Presbyterian canting, *Even where these are, who are giving to Christ much work (to speak so) to wash and make them clean from their daily pollutions and defilements, and have renounced the works of darkness, &c.* I desire to know of him the next time, how these can be said to have renounced the works of darkness, who have need to be washed from their daily

daily defilements. To my argument shewing that Christ's command to be perfect proves it possible, he saith, p. 344. *that this only proves we should endeavour after it.* But for this he addeth no proof, we must rest contented with his meer affirmation, as we must also do throughout the next N. 26. where he confidently preacheth his own sense of Scriptur, in stead of answer or reason, and then concludes with a railing saying, *I am led by an anti-Evangelical and Diabolical spirit.* He saith that *Matth. 7: 21.* and some other places cited by me prove nothing, without supposing that no man shall be saved, who ever sinned, but without giving any reason: that the unconverted may be by the Grace of God converted, and consequently made perfect, I deny not. He saith *Rom. 6.* speaks only of the dominion of sin. And what then? Doth not every sin bring him, that commits it, under the power of that sin, in so far? To the instances of *Enoch, Noah,* and others, whom the Scripturs call *Perfect,* he goes about to prove they sometimes sinned. And what then? the question is not Whether they always were without sin? but Whether they never were without it? and sinned daily? which is his affirmation. Which if they had done, they could at no time have been called *perfect.* As for his other glosses, it will be time to receive them, when he proves them; it is not enough to make them authentik with me, though *Augustin* had approved, if he will subscribe to all *Augustin's* glosses of Scriptur, I may give him a further answer.

¶ § Pag. 346. n. 28. He comes to take notice of my answers to their arguments, and first to my answer to their arguing from *1 Joh. 1: 8.* *If we say, we have no sin, we deceive our selves, &c.* that this will not prove the Apostle included more than *James, c. 3: v. 9, 10.* he answereth, *the Apostle is included, though not for the present time.* If it be not for the present time, then it will not plead for sinning daily in thought, word, and deed, which is the case in hand. Next, supposing the Apostle were not included, he saith, *it is enough that Believers are included.* But this he affirms without proof, troubling himself and the Reader, to prove that those *John* wrote to were Believers, which no body will deny; yet though they were included, it will not prove such a continual and daily sinning, as they plead for. In answer to my shewing the words are *have not sin,* and not *ye sin not,* he only proves that they did or may sin, which I deny not. And then, when I say it may be affirmed of the Seed of sin, he concludes *this to be sinfull, so as to affect the man,* but

minds not to prove it, and with this manner of begging the question he concludes this paragraph, *pag. 347.* To my shewing that in 1 *King. 8 : 46.* & *Eccles. 7 : 20.* there is nothing said of sinning daily, he answers, *It is express in Ecclesiastes, that there is not a just man upon earth, that doth good and sinneth not, clearly importing, that even in their doing good, they sin;* but that this is clearly imported he affirmeth, but proveth not, though there be no man that sinneth not, it will not follow they sin daily. And for his alledging that my answer, that it will not thence follow that, though there was none that did not sin at that time, there are none such now, or that it is impossible there should be such, will infer there was none then regenerate, no not *Solomon* himself; what if I should say so, understanding Regeneration in the absolute sense? To what I shew from the Hebrew word, that it may be interpreted, not *that sinneth not*, but *that may not sin*, he tells me in sum, that *it is but vanity*, and this he saith is obvious to every Reader, to whom we will then leave it. To my affirming that the Apostle is not (*Rom. 7 : 14.*) speaking of himself, but personating others in that state, after he has told me that *Socinians* and *Arminians* say so, he tells me, *the circumstances of the Text evince the contrary*, and then gives a kind of a preachment upon the place, which I shall accept as a declaration of his sense, but must wait the next time to have him prove it. He saith *the Apostle doth not contradict this*, chap. 6 : 2. That the Apostle doth not contradict himself, is without doubt to me; but he must endeavour to reconcile the meaning he gives to the Apostle's words when he has leasur. He saith *Paul in a respect was a carnal man*, but unless he prove him to have been so, in respect of sinning at that time, he saith nothing. To my urging *Rom. 8 : 35.* where the Apostle saith *Nothing shall separat him*, because, where sin is continued, there is a separation He denieth, that, where sin is striven and wrestled against, it maketh a separation; but the matter is how he proveth, that those, who strive and wrestle against sin, do daily commit sin: and untill he do this, he but begs the question. To prove the impossibility of being free from sinning daily, from the examples of *Noah's* and *David's* sins, he useth this argument:

*If these men, whom the Spirit of God stilleth Perfect, and men according to God's heart, have had their failings, and these failings are registered for our use; Then we have no Scriptur warrant for such a Perfection here, as is not attended with sin:*

[ he



[he should have said *as doth not admit a sinning daily, in thought, word, and deed*, if he would have concluded according to the state of the question.]

*But the former is true: Therefore, &c.*

But I deny the consequence of this Proposition, or the connexion of the Major, besides the argument is defective divers ways, if he had stated and then proven it, that, if such, whom the Scriptures call *Perfect*, did break the commands daily, in thought, word, and deed, then he had argued to the purpose: and for their *failings* being recorded to our use, it can not infer the necessity of our sinning daily, unless he will be so absurd, as to say, that they are therefore recorded, that we may imitat their failings, and not avoid them. In fine let him cause his argument conclude in the term of the question, to wit, *that every man, notwithstanding any Grace received, must sin daily, in thought, word, and deed*, and prove his Propositions, and he shall not want either an acknowledgment, or an answer. And lastly, to conclude this chapter, he saith, *I should rather have cited the old Begardi, than the Fathers, and the old Alumbados, who had the same opinion, and practices sutable.* But if their opinion was, that men may be free of sin, and their practices sutable, sure then they were perfect, and if so, deserve more to be followed, than I. B. or his Brethren, whose principle and practice (as himself confesseth) is for sin, and daily continuing in it, against any perfection, except such as can admit of sin, for to be *breaking the commands daily, in thought, word, and deed*, is essential to his Christianity.

### Section. Tenth,

Wherein his Fifteenth Chapter, of *PERSEVERANCE*, is considered.

¶ 1. **I**n this chapter of *Perseverance* it would seem the man fanstieth he hath got into the pulpit, for he affirms, as if all, that read him, were bound to believe without further inquiry; for, after he has introduced himself with his old accusation of *Pelagianism*, he concludeth this doctrine of the possibility of falling from Grace to depend upon *free-will*, and ushereth-in a long invective against this, as maintained by me, upon the supposition of his old re-iterated calumny, *that I asserted all the regeneration of the Saints to proceed only from the Light of Nature, without the* effe-

*effectual operation of the Spirit of Grace*, which how false it is hath above been shewn: he giveth us a large citation out of their *Confession of Faith*, with an account thence deduced (or explication thereupon) in what respect they hold Perseverance. Wherein if he will hold to the first asserted by him, to wit, *that they assert not the perseverance of any that are not truly regenerated*, we are agreed, for in that sense I never did deny it. And then he gives eight considerations for their doctrine, all which conclude nothing but upon the supposition of the truth of their former principles, especially of *Election* and *absolute Reprobation*, so that it is but a begging of the question, as his very eighth consideration shews, *pag. 356. n. 14.* to wit, *that the affirming this doctrine* (to wit, that there may be a falling-away from beginnings of true and saving Grace) *will give a blow unto many articles of their Faith*: but can this have any weight to convince such as do not believe these articles of their Faith? It seems then it is nor for me or any Quaker that this is written, so we are the less concerned to trouble our selves with it.

¶ 2. At last he comes, *pag. 357. n. 15.* to examin my arguments, and first to what I urge from *Jud. vers. 4.* where it is spoken of some, that turned the Grace of God into wantonness, he saith, *this is not understood of the true Grace of God, but external grace, such as is that Tit. 2: 12. which teacheth to deny ungodliness*, but for this he gives no proof. Next it seems to him *the Grace of God, that teacheth to deny ungodliness*, mentioned *Tit. 2: v. 12. is not the true Grace of God.* where learned he this, or how proveth he it? He saith, *to understand the faith, which some are said to have made shipwreck of, 1 Tim. 1: 19. to be true and saving faith, is contrary to 2 Tim. 2: 17. and other places, where the doctrine of faith is spoken of, thence he concludes it was only the doctrine of faith they fell from*: but this is a conclusion fit only for credulous persons, and proveth nothing, unless he will argue because in some places the doctrine of faith is spoken of, therefore wherever faith is spoken of, it must be understood of the doctrine of Faith, and not of true and saving Faith, which were most absurd. He saith to *Heb. 6: 4, 5. the words are not absolute, but conditional, if they fall-away*: but such a condition importeth the thing supposed, to be possible, being given for a caution. He adds, *there is nothing there that is necessarily to be understood of true and saving Grace*: but let him inform, according to Scriptur, how any man can come to *tast of the Heavenly Gift, and of the Powers of the Life to come*, and be made partaker of the Holy Ghost, with-

without true and saving Grace. For what he adds to this, being built upon the supposition of *Election*, I refer it to what is above said upon this subject. He concludes *Vossius's* testimony to be false, in saying, *that this was the common opinion of the Antients*. But if so little credit be to be given him, he did not wel that made so much use of him to prove what was *Pelagius's doctrine*, as he has done throughout this Treatise. For *Iohn Owen's* citations, I have neither accommodation nor time at present to examin them, it is enough to me that this is contrary to Scriptur, though all these he mentions had said so. To prove that men may have a good Conscience, and yet want true faith, he bringeth *Paul's* words, *Act. 23: v. 1.* where, speaking of himself while a *Pharisee*, he saith, *he lived in all good Conscience before God, &c.* but that will not meet this case. Those *1 Tim. 1: 19.* who are said to *make shipwrack of a good Conscience*, are such who believed the true doctrine of faith in Christ, as himself before acknowledged. Now albeit a man may be said to live in good Conscience to other principles, while ignorant of this, yet he should prove how a man can be said to have a good Conscience, with respect to the true faith of Christ, held by him, and yet without saving or true grace. With railing he tels me, *pag. 358. n. 18.* that *Phil. 1: 6. & 1 Pet. 1: 5. speak of God's beginning and perfecting the condition*. And what then? yet God doth not this against our wills, it is with a respect to our performing the conditions on our part, which yet we can not do without him. Then he goes about to prove that *Paul* could not fall, in answer to my saying from *1 Cor. 9: 27.* that *Paul* supposeth a possibility that he might become a reprobate: but if the Reader consider how I bring that in my Apology, he will find he had no reason for this cavill, for I alledged it only to reprove those that are too too secure, shewing, where sin was, there was always aground of jealousy, since the Apostle did reckon it needfull to keep under his body, to subdue sin, that he might not become a reprobate, which since the Apostle did, but upon this supposition, if he did not keep under his body, suppose possible, others had no reason to presume.

## Section, Eleventh,

Wherein his XVI Chapter *Of the Church*, his XVII *Of the Ministerial Call*, his XVIII, XIX and XXI *Of their Qualifications, Office, and Maintenance*, and his XX *Of Womens Preaching*, is considered.

¶ 1. **H**is chapter of the *Church* is soon dispatched, for it contains scarce any thing but perversions and railing; for after he has given a large citation out of their Confession of Faith, and then added some enlargements of his own; and some little nibbling cavils to what I say of no Salvation being without the Church, pag. 361. he goes on with his old reiterated calumny, that I suppose men may be made members of the *Catholik Church by the Light of Nature*, which is utterly false. And upon this false supposition is built his n. 5. pag. 362. as also what he saith, pag. 364. But n. 4. he screws this to a greater pitch of falshood, affirming that what I say of a *Particular Church gathered together in the faith of the true Principles and Doctrins of Christ, by the Spirit of God and testimony of some of his Ministers*, is, that these are persons only taught by the *Light of Nature*, and by such Ministers, as preach nothing of the Gospel. Against a man thus desperately resolved and determined to lye and calumniat, there can be no guard; but sure all sober Readers will abhor such dealing. What I speak of a Church, in this respect, is only of such as have the advantage of the outward knowledge of Christ, as my words afterwards shew, where I say, such were the Churches gathered by the Apostles, of which the Scriptur makes mention. And therefore what he objects that can not be don by *Pagans* is wholly impertinent, and doth but verify the grossness of his calumny, which he endeavours to inculcat as a truth to his Reader, pag. 363. as if what I say further of the things requisite to be a member of this *Particular Church* were a third sort, and not a more particular description of the former, which the Reader may easily observe, by looking to the place, to be a meer fetch of his, to afford himself some matter of cavill, which imagining he has got, he fills-up the paragraph with gross lyes and railing, saying, That the Quakers believe not the holy Truths set down in the Scripturs, because they oppose and contradict them: That they believe not in, nor make profession of, *Jesus Christ revealed in the New Testament*.

flament, because they oppose him and all his Institutions: That faith, according to them, is not wrought by the Spirit of God, but that Nature can sweetly and naturally incline yea compell thereunto, All which are gross calumnys. And then he concludeth, saying, *And thus we have run round, and are again where we began*, which is very true, for he began with calumnys, and having run round the same way, his work resolves in them. Pag. 364. he affirmeth Men may be Members of the visible Church (and consequently ought to be reputed such) *who are ungodly and without holiness*, and offereth to make it good, if I will form a dispute upon it; but I leave him, as to this, to dispute with his learned Dr. Owen, whose works he has applauded in this Treatise, and whom his Postscript-Brother R. M. has in his preface to this J. B.'s book highly commended, as a gracious man. As for his silly argument, that from the Apostle's saying, *Act. 2: 39. -- the promise is unto you, and to your children*, and *1 Cor. 7: 14.* it follows men become members of the Church by birth, I leave him to debate it with his great Author Thomas Hicks, who will tell him (if he be consonant to his own principles) it is a Babylonish invention. But I. B. hath here unawares contradicted himself, for if these Scriptures prove men become members of the Church by birth, then the sprinkling them with water sometime after they are born, or their *Baby-Baptism*, is not necessary to make them members of the Church, and they are to be accounted such without it. He saith, *I am mistaken, when I say, Antichrist built his structure upon this foundation*, (to wit, that men without holiness may be members of the true Church) *because he applieth all the priviledges of the invisible Church unto his visible Synagogue of Satan*: whereas this sheweth that I am not mistaken, but that my affirmation is true; for if he, to wit, Antichrist, did believe holiness to be necessary to make a member of the true Church, he could not apply the privileges of the invisible Church unto his visible members, most of which he wel knows (as often-times himself) are not only void of, but enemies to, holiness. It is false that I agree with him in his not distinguishing betwixt the Visible and Invisible Church, and yet much more in unchurching all who are not of his combination; in which albeit I. B. most impudently insinuates I approach to him, yet himself can not but know it to be a most manifest falshood, since I suppose some of all sects of Christians may be members of the catholik Church, and he knows, and has observed here, how contrary the Pope is to this doctrine. At last he concludes this chapter with a fit of Railing, of which the last words must

not pass without observation, to wit, *that in stead of true holyness I press upon them a natural, dead, and anti-Evangelical Morality.* Now this Morality, as pressed by me, he himself confessed before to be such as the Law of Nature taught, (albeit in truth I pressed none but what is through the Light of Christ, or Grace of God that is by Christ) which he acknowledged *did lead men not to murder, not to steal, not to commit adultery,* which he confessed also *was just, holy and good.* And so it seems, according to him, that, which is holy, just and good, not to murder, not to steal, not to commit adultery, is no part of true holiness, yea is anti-evangelik and contrary to the Gospel. Now if I would insist after his method, having much more reason than he, I might at large shew what a Pagan-Gospel to purpose his must be, that is contrary to honesty, chastity, and innocency; albeit I deny not but the true Gospel teacheth more than the height of meer Morality.

¶ 2. He beginneth his 17 chapter, entituled of *a Ministerial Call,* after the repetition of some part of my 10. *Thesis,* with his old reiterated calumny and false supposition, *that I asseme men to be called and qualified to the Ministry by the Light of Nature:* and to this purpose, to help him to fill up the paper, he insisteth, pag. 369, 370, 371. which being false, all that is built upon it falls to the ground. In this chapter also he is very liberal of his *Railing:* Take one instance, pag. 372. where he saith, *That the Quakers are Pagan Preachers, who know not the Gospel, but are sworn enemies to it, and plain subverters of it, and all the Ordinances thereof.* And pag. 378. he saith, *They are a company of the most desperat antichristian opposers of Christ and all his appointments, that ever the Sun shined on.* More of this kind may be seen, pag. 374, 375, & 376.

Pag. 366. n. 3. He saith, when I speak of a true call to the Ministry, I mult suppose Ten things, which he after enumerateth, and albeit I judge not my self obliged to follow him in such excursions, yet, for the Reader's satisfaction, let it be observed, That I deny not but what I speak here is *with a relation to a visible Church,* which is his first supposition. Secondly, *That I acknowledge that in it there must be a standing Ministry, which is necessary,* and this is his second and third. *That I acknowledge this to be an Institution of Jesus Christ,* which is his fourth. *That None ought to take this upon him, without being lawfully called thereunto,* which is his fifth. *That also None may take upon them that work, but such as are called to the Ministry,* so as *to exercise it constantly, as exercised by Ministers;* yet a man may, when particularly



cularly called by the Spirit thereunto, do that which is the work of a Minister, which his doing prohib & nunc maketh him not a Minister properly, and this is his sixth. That neither the Work nor Office is common to all the Members, so that they may not do it simply as Members, which is his seventh and eighth. That a Call differeth from Gifts and Qualifications, which is his ninth. And lastly, That there are some Rules in the Scriptur (if he understand general Rules, as I suppose he doth) which difference a true Call from a false, which is his tenth supposition. Now wherein I here disagree from other Quakers, or my self, as he insinuateth, he may be pleased next time to inform. I might pass what he saith in the next paragraph, pag. 368. concerning the several sorts of Calls to the Ministry, as containing no answer to me, were it not to shew that he there but begs the question, and contradicts himself. (1.) He begs the question, while he supposeth that the approbation and concurrence of men, in a call, hinders the call from being immediat, and that there is no immediat call now, which he all affirms without proof. (2.) Of Mediat Calls he saith, some are Rare and Singular, when a Church is erecting, and another Ordinary, according to the Rules set down in the Word. So it seems the Rare and Singular Call, which is usually ascribed to that of the first Reformers, was not according to the Rules prescribed in the Word. But, if such Rules be set down, by what authority, without the Word, can he affirm they may be dispensed with, if he contradict not his own Principles? (3.) He saith there must be an Inward Call, which is the signification of God's mind, of his calling and appointing him to the Ministry. This is good, and it is false that he saith, pag. 372. that this will not satisfy us. Yet he can not stand to this, but contradicts it, pag. 372. speaking of my words thus, *What meaneth he by this, must be called by the Spirit? Is this an inward Inspiration, or Enthusiasme, saying to the man, he must go preach? We reject all such phancies, &c.* But is not an inward call, signifying God's mind to a man of his calling him to the Ministry, an inward inspiration, telling him he must go preach? Or can an inward call be without an inward inspiration? The Reader may judge of these inconsistencies. As to his question, pag. 369. *Whether to be instructed by the inward Virtue and Power of God in the heart be so necessary to a Minister, that he can not be without it?* I say it is, and the Reader may observe how he is pinched, while himself is loath to say otherwise, pag. 370. yet at last he saith, *he dare not say it*, referring to his learned Mr Durham, as he calls him, and giving the example of Judas; of which

hereafter. However we see, according to him, that *not only one who wanteth holiness, but even a Devil may and ought to be esteemed, heard and obeyed, as a Minister of Christ*, and that all they judge needfull in the Call and Qualification of a Gospel Minister may agree to the Devil himself, nor can they be sure but their Ministers may be all Devils, for ought they know. It is false that he addeth in this page 370. that I agree with Socinians and Arminians, in affirming that *whoever understands the Truth of the Gospel, and are able to instruct others, may and have right to teach*. This I no-where affirmed, and do wholly deny whatever knowledge or ability a man have to instruct, by reason of his gifts either natural or acquired, that he ought to take upon him to teach, without being particularly called thereunto; and therefore the Scriptures he brings against such as say so, are not to the purpose against me. To my first argument he confesseth that *it proveth the necessity I speak of, to make a man a real, upright, and sincere Minister, before God*, but that any that are not real and upright are to be esteemed Ministers at all, or heard, as such, I deny, and remains for him to prove. Why are we so often forbidden to hear false Teachers? And that this is not only with respect to teaching false doctrine, the Apostle shews, 2 Tim. 3: v. 5. where he exhorts to *turn away from such as have the form of godliness only*, (which can not consist with false doctrine) To my second Argument, mentioned pag. 372. he confesseth, what he saith further in that paragraph is above answered. To my argument shewing that if the Inward testimony of the Spirit be not thought needfull, the Gospel-Ministry should be postponed to the Legal, he most ridiculously answers *then the Jews needed to doubt of the Priests and Levites*; whereas my argument was, if they were certain, and we should be uncertain, it would make the Evangelical worse than the Legal: and therefore to this he returneth nothing further but railing. Pag. 373. n. 10. he asketh, how I will prove that *all such as want the call of the Spirit come not in by the door, but are thieves and robbers*, affirming here *a man may come in the way appointed by Christ, though they want this*; whereas before, pag. 369. and in the end of this page he affirms the necessity of an inward call, saying they *must have an inward call*. I run not out, as he alledgeth, upon a mistake, in saying, the succession of the Church is objected against this doctrine, albeit I. B. and his *We* may not do so, since I write to others than he will perhaps include in his *We*. He bestoweth his n. 12. pag. 374. in railing, and referring to what is formerly said by him, pag. 375. n. 13. To my an-

answer to that objection, that who pretend to an immediat call, should prove it by miracles, shewing it was the same objected by *Papists* against the primitive *Protestants*, he in a frothy manner desires me to take it thus, and it will be too hot for my fingers, *that they who had immediat calls from God were able to give evidence of the same by miracles or some other evident testimony of the Spirit, which to contradict had been iniquity and utterly unreasonable.* I grant the whole, and therefore desire him to shew me, and prove it, what way the first Reformers did thus evidence their call, which is not done by those called *Quakers*, but his probation must be somewhat solidier than the railing with which he filleth up the rest of this paragraph. *Pag. 376. n. 14.* (as it should be marked) he argueth against my saying that such as receive and believe the call of true Ministers verify it, and become the signes of their Apostleship. *2 Cor. 13 : 3.* albeit this was the very answer given by *Beza* to *Claudian Espensew* at the conference of *Poissy*, and let him urge this if he can, any way against us, which may not be as wel urged by *Protestants* against *Papists*, and if he can not, he doth but work for his great Father the *Pope*, to whom to their great shame the *Protestant Clergy* begin to recurr, to justify their calling.

Having ended this paragraph with railing, he begins the next with a silly groundless perversion and inference, *viz.* that because I say that this, to wit, the inward Life and Vertue, which is in true Ministers, is that, which giveth to the Minister the true and substantial call and title, it follows that *the extraordinary call was no true and substantial title*, as if any extraordinary call wanted this life and vertue, and that, albeit it prove an evidence to such as receive them, yet some may have it who are rejected of rebellious men. To prove the necessity of *laying-on of hands*, he asketh *Why then were hands laid upon Paul and Barnabas Act. 13 : 3.* ? citing other places. *Answer.* Because there was then a Spiritual vertue communicated by that action, which they ascribe not to theirs, yea the places cited by him prove it, as *Mark 16 : 18. Luk 13 : 13.* where the laying-on of hands is said to cure the sick. I said not that the laying-on of hands *always* was the giving of the Holy Ghost, it is enough if it was a communicating of some spiritual vertue, which by their own confession theirs is not. After he has ended this paragraph with railing, he ends this chapter with observing *the infallibility pleaded for in Ministers by some Quakers*: but if he judgeth them to err in this, he should have applied himself to them, answering the arguments, by which they vindicate what they say in that matter.

I come

¶ 3. I come now to his 18 chapter of *Ministerial Qualifications*, where, after he has begun and repeated some words of mine, he will have the *Grace of God* to respect not the *esse* or *being*, but *benè esse* or *wel-being* of a Minister; albeit elsewhere he would be mincing this and eating it up, yet it appears to be his belief, to prove which he asketh, *pag. 380.* what I think of *Balaam, who is called a Prophet, not a false Prophet?* But he hath not proven that no more is required in a Gospel Minister, than in a Prophet merely to fore-tell things to come. God's speaking to him urgeth nothing, for God spake also to *Cain*, as himself confesseth, *chap. 3.* yet it will not follow that *Cain* had all the qualifications requisite to a Gospel-Minister. To my answer of *Judas*, that they had not proved he wanted Grace when called, he refers to what is written of the possibility of falling from Grace, to which also I refer it, and in this also resolveth what he saith, *pag. 380. n. 4.* in his very first paragraph he has his old calumny, *that all the power, vertue and life of the Spirit, according to me, is not to be understood of what is imported by these words in Scriptur*, and this he insinuateth again, *pag. 379, 380-384.* but as this is false, so what is built upon it falls to the ground. Because I deny the absolute necessity of humane learning to the Ministry, therefore he insinuates as if I thought it utterly useles, *pag. 379.* which is false. And so what he saith, *p. 382, 383, 384.* to prove the usefulness of natural Sciences is to no purpose against me, who deny not their usefulness among men, nor yet say, when wel improved, they are useles to a Minister, or that such things may not be improved by a Minister, when acted by the Spirit so to do, as *Paul* did the saying of the Heathen Poet. The thing then I only deny, is, *that they are absolutely needfull qualifications to a Minister.* What he mentions to be said by *Calvin* of the Philosophy spoken of by *Paul*, *Col. 2: 8.* I can very wel agree to, without prejudice to any thing said by me, I do not say, as he falsely affirms *p. 383.* that *Learning and Grace* are contradictory. And whereas he saith he is far from saying that Learning is more necessary than Grace, he doth but cheat his Reader, and contradict himself and his learned *Mr. Durham*, who makes *Grace* only needfull to the *wel-being*, but *Learning* to the *being* of a Minister. And their admitting of Ministers shews this, for they will admit none, till they be sure he has Learning, but many whom they are not sure have Grace, yea upon the supposition they want Grace, yet they think they ought to be held and reputed by the People as true and lawfull Ministers. And whereas he insinuateth,

Sect. XI. Of Ministerial Qualifications. 137

pag. 383. that I bring-in a *fable*, which he saith I *have ready at hand*; if he dare charge me in this with the asserting of a falshood, in matter of fact, I will give evidence for proof, the persons being yet alive, but untill he do that, my knowing the thing to be true gives me ground enough to assert it. To my argument shewing that without Grace a man can not be a member of Christ's Body, which is the Church, far less a Minister, in stead of answer, after he has accused me as not understanding the difference betwixt the *Visible and Invisible Church*, he tels, *Christ is an Head to both*, which I deny not: that I apply Eph. 4: 7. 11. 16. 1 Cor. 12. solely to the Invisible Church, so as to exclude the Visible, is his mistake, not my ignorance. Then he goeth about to shew the difference betwixt *Gifts* and *Grace*; but that any had the gifts, there mentioned, who were altogether void of Grace, remains for him to prove. Besides what is mentioned, he is not sparing of his calumnies in this chapter, as where he saith, pag. 382. that I deny *that about the time of Reformation there was a Christian World*, which is false, in respect of Profession, in which sense I only here understood it; and pag. 385. albeit he find me calling the heresy of *Arius* horrid, yet upon the trust of his Author Mr. *Clapham* he affirmeth the *Quakers* to be in this *erroneous*: but sure I have better reason to be acquainted with the *Quakers* doctrins, than any of his lying Authors. Another of his calumnys is, pag. 386. *that we lay-aside all means in coming to the Saving knowledge of God's Name*: and albeit his railing in this chapter be thick enough, that the Reader may easily observe it, yet for his more particular direction, let him observe, 380, 381-385, 386. And whereas, pag. 386. n. 11. he enumerateth several particulars, wherein he affirmeth *we agree with Papists*, he may find them refuted and answered in G. K's book, called *Quakerism no Popery*. And in the last two sections of that book written by me he may find himself and his Brethren proved far more guilty of that crime than we, which because the Professor *Iohn Menzies*, against whom it is written, found not yet time to answer, he, as having more leasur, may assume that province. If the increase of our number be, as he saith, *a clear verification* of 2 Thess. 2: 9, 10, 11, 12. *that we are of the deluded ones* there spoken of, then it must be a clearer verification of it, as to them, that they are of that deluded company, since they are more numerous than we, and also increased more suddenly. As for his exhortations and wishes in the end, because I will be so charitable as to suppose they come from some mea-

fur of sincerity, I do not wholly reject them, only I must tell him, that nothing has more conduced, of an external mean, to confirm me in the belief of the verity of the principles I hold, than his treatise, because of the many gross calumnys, manifest perversions, and furious railing in it; since I know the Truth needed no such method to defend it, and I can not believe one in the Truth would use it, since lying is contrary to the Truth, therefore if he will lay aside all this falshood and passion, he may have a more sure ground of hope to see the truth manifested to the dispelling of Error.

¶ 4. He beginneth his 19 chapter of the Ministerial Office with supposing that their Order is according to Scriptur, and that what we plead for is quite contrary; and so ushereth himself into a rant of railing, with which he concludeth this paragraph, saying that the *evil Spirit that accuseth us, is such an Enemy to all Gospel Order, that it cryeth up only Paganish and Devilish Confusion.* More of this kind the Reader may observe, pag. 388. 389. 391, 392-394. His calumnies and perversions are also very frequent in this chapter, as pag. 387. where he saith, *We cast-away all Order, and in stead thereof bring-in the confusion of Babel.* and pag. 388. because we are not for the shaddow without the substance, therefore he saith *We make a repugnancy betwixt them*, which is also false: and again in the same page N. 4. because I say it was never the mind of Christ to establish the shaddow of Officers, without the power and efficacy of the Spirit, therefore he concludes *that the Quakers think that men can establish the Spirit*, which silly perversion will easily be manifest to every intelligent Reader. And after the like manner pag. 389. n. 5. because I say that upon setting-up meer shaddows, where the Substance was wanting, the work of Antichrist was erected, in the dark night of Apostasy; he concludes, that then (according to me) *Christ and his Apostles wrought the work of Antichrist, and mystery of iniquity*, accusing me thence of blasphemy. But who can be so blind, as not to see this manifest perversion? And again, pag. 390. he saith, *I will that every man, according as his own spirit (falsly called the Spirit of God) moveth him, setting to this work*, meaning that of the Ministry; which is a false calumny, never said by me, who deny all false motions of man's own spirit, however called. And pag. 391. he saith *that malice prompteth me to charge them with ouning the distinction of Clergy and Laity, though I know they do not*: where the man supposeth that what I write is only written against the Presbyterians, while he can not but know that



I write against others, since in his first chapter he charges me with writing against all the Christian World: so it is his malice to say I charge them with it, if any of those I write to be guilty of it, it is enough, albeit I doubt whether the *Presbyterians* can free themselves of it.

¶ 5. Having thus far discovered his perversions, I come to the main business, pag. 388. he saith *they plead not for shadows, but own the Ordinances, as Christ hath appointed to remain and continue for the perfecting of the Saints, &c.* Eph. 4: 11, 12, 13. And pag. 389. n. 6. he asketh *whether the primitive Church was not instituted by Christ, and gathered by God, in whose assembly he was Ruler and Governour?* asking, *were there no distinct Officers, particular individual Persons, set apart for the work of the Ministry, in the Apostles days?* And p. 391. n. 7. he argueth against my saying that these mentioned 1 Cor. 12: 28, 29. & Rom. 12: 6. were not distinct Officers, but only different operations of the same Spirit, and against this also he pleadeth, p. 393. n. 11. & 394. To all which I answer distinctly and particularly, that they can plead nothing from Eph. 4. unless their Church had all the Officers there mentioned, which it has not, yea and which themselves affirm are ceased, such as Prophets, Apostles, which are said to be given for the work of the Ministry and perfecting of the Saints, nothing less than the other: and by what authority do they then turn these by, and plead so tenaciously for the other? Let him give a reason for this next, and by the same we shall answer what he urges from this, but he must remember it is not enough for him barely to say, these were extraordinary and are ceased; and the other ordinary and remain; but he must prove it by plain Scriptur, or else be justly rejected, as but begging the question, as he doth pag. 394. where he supposeth there were only 13 Apostles, or perhaps 14, if Barnabas be accounted one, since he knowleth the word signifies one *sent*, and therefore whoever is *sent* is properly an Apostle. Thus also will his other argument return upon his own head, for since *such* (as he saith) *were settled and ordained in the Church by Christ and his Apostles*, how come they to walk so contrary to Christ's Order, as to want, yea and to judge such unnecessary, in their Church? And as for all the Scriptures cited by him, to shew the distinction of such Church Officers from other Members, they are not to the purpose against me, who deny not but Members were to be distinguished; but yet that proves not that any Member was barred from these exercises, when called by the Spirit thereto, which is the thing in question. As for his saying

that the Apostle is speaking of the Church, 1 Cor. 12. as an *Organical body*, if he means the Apostle is comparing the Church to a *Body*, to which it answers in many respects, I deny not, but if he say that it answers in all, I leave him to prove it: however then if we make application of it, as, the Apostle illustrateth it, their Church will prove a very lame one, for in this Body (as I. B. himself observs.) the Apostle names *Apostles* and *Prophets*, and if we may suppose that these, as being the most eminent, are the chiefest Members, as the *eyes* and *ears* of the Body, their Church that wanteth these, must be blind and deaf. And whereas he would make my saying, that the Apostle meant here different operations, ridiculous; he but sheweth his own folly, for if the Apostle point at different Offices, they will not only want *Apostles*, *Prophets* and *Evangelists*, but a great many more, for the Apostle nameth also *verse 28. miracles, gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues; &c.* these then must all be distinct Offices also: how come they to want them in their Church? or how can they plead for these they have, more than for such as are placed nothing less by way of distinct Officers, than they? Yea all the several titles, enumerated by him, *pag. 390.* will prove the same way distinct Officers, and how came they to cashier all these, and reduce them to so few a number? By what authority and Scriptur warrant do they this? But I would enquire at him what an Office is? if it be not an operation of the Spirit, more particularly working in some persons under such a designation. And this is proved by the coincidency of these Offices in one person, which he confesseth: that some are thence more particularly called to the work of the Ministry, I acknowledge, and he observs it. That God will move none to violate the Order established in his house, I deny not; but that to move some at times to speak, is a violation of that Order, I deny, since the Apostle saith the contrary, 1 Cor. 14: 31. *we may all prophesy.* In answer to which he supposeth this is restricted to *Prophets*, but the Text saith *all*, not all *Prophets* (albeit it were no absurdity to suppose all the Lord's People to be *Prophets* in this sense, as well as they are said to be *Kings* and *Priests*) and the words following shew it: *but all may learn, and all may be comforted*, for it were nonsense to understand this with a restriction. And therefore his bare asserting, that this contradicts the plain scope of the place, is no argument for men of reason, who resolve not to build their faith upon his meer say so. *Pag. 395.* he thinketh my acknowledging that *some are more par-*  
*ticu-*

*particularly called to the work of the Ministry than others, is not enough, because they are not to exhort but when moved by the Spirit, and others when moved may as well as they, so there is no difference.* That Ministers ought not to preach or exhort without the Spirit's motion or assistance, will come afterwards to be proved, and to suppose God can not or will not move any but Ministers by his Spirit, to exhort, were to limit him, which is presumptuous in us to do: but in this appeareth the difference, that we confess many may, and know thousands among us, whom we acknowledge to be good men, and sufficiently endued with the Spirit, towards the work of regeneration in themselves, and brotherly love and care to their brethren; who never find themselves moved to speak a word in publick: and there are others, whom God calleth, to make teaching and the oversight of the Church to their constant business, that they are less engaged in worldly affairs, than the generality of those called *Clergy-men*, even among *I. B's* Brethren, and therefore are owned and honoured, and so far as need requires, maintained by the Church. But to say that no man ought, without he be thus particularly called, at any time speak in a publick assembly, (since we say, that they ought not, but when moved by the Spirit) is not only to accuse us, but imperiously bind up God, from moving with his Spirit whom and when he pleaseth: and this being applied will answer his queries, *pag. 369. where, n. 14. he affirms, that to suppose Ministers may use an honest trade, is to account the work of the Ministry a light business:* But this is to account it no more a light business, than the Apostle did, who recommended working with their hands for a livelyhood to the Elders of the Church of *Ephesus*, *Act. 20: 34. 35.* giving them his own example in so doing. But they indeed must have small experience of a true Ministry, who do not know a man may be better qualified to discharge it, by being inwardly exercised in the Spirit and instructed thereby, than by all the labour and study they can derive from their books; and perhaps it may be true, which he after affirms, that *such who bring their preaching always out of books, will find little time to follow another trade:* but it seems such Preachers are incapable to follow the Apostle's exhortation above mentioned, and therefore we will justly conclude them to be no true Gospel-Ministers.

¶ 5. That he may be like himself, he begins his 20 chapter of *Woman-Preachers* with railing, saying *the Quakers are against all the appointments and ordinances of Christ*; then he goeth-on at a high rate, inveighing against

*the liberty of Womens speaking*, from Paul's words, 1 Cor. 14: 34. *as being against the Law, as being contrary to modesty and shamesfacedness*, urging, pag. 398. the Apostle's authority in writing that epistle, which we deny not, and then he urgeth against us 1 Tim. 2: 11. alledging that its being said *Adam was first formed, and then Eva, and Eva being first in the transgression* infers that Womens preaching is *against the Law of Nature, and that this silence is imposed upon Women as a just judgment for Eva's transgression*, for this last inference we have nothing but his affirmation, to the former I answered in my Apology, shewing that these words of the Apostle can not be taken absolutely, and without limitation, since the same Apostle giveth rules how Women should behave themselves in their praying and preaching in the Church. But he reckons that this is for me to make the Apostle contradict himself, while this is his own case, who takes the Apostle's words without limitation, else there is not the least contradiction, yea his desiring them to *ask their husbands at home* shews that it can not be taken universally, seeing all women have not husbands. And for his saying that what the Apostle saith, chap. 11: v. 5. *But every woman, that prayeth, or prophesieth with her head uncovered, &c. is not to be meant of their carriage when they are praying themselves, but when they are present at others doing of it*, this is his bare affirmation without proof, contrary to the express words of the Text, which saith *every woman that prayeth, &c.* not when she heareth another pray. And by this way it might be as easily affirmed, where the Apostle in the same place speaks of mens praying with their heads covered, that it is not when they pray themselves, but when they hear others. And that there must be a limitation he confesseth saying, *that the Lord made use of Prophetesses of old, and that he is free to make use of whom he will*. If so then, if the Lord do so now, who dare plead against it? Yea the practice of I. B.'s brethren doth contradict this Scripture, if they will not admit a limitation; for will he deny but heretofore at Presbyterian meetings, where sometimes 20 and 30 and more have been together, Women have both spoken and prayed, yea been invited and urged to do so by eminent preachers there present? And is not that properly a Church, where Christians are met together to worship God and edify one another? If he say this was only *private*, I answer: However *Private* it was, it was still a Church, for it is not the greatness of the number that makes the Church, since the fewer number may more properly sometimes be esteemed the Church, than the greater. And if he take the-

the Apostle's words absolutely without limitation, it will exclude Women from speaking in any assembly met for Religious worship and exercise, unless he will be so superstitious as to ascribe the Churchship to the *old Popish Mass-house walls* (and if so, it will trouble him to prove there were any such in *Corinth* used by Christians, when the Apostle wrote to them) so as to think that if women speak not there, they do not speak in the Church. And yet how comes it that by the Acts of the *General Assembly* whores are not only permitted but constrained to speak in the most publick Assemblies, and that in a place allotted for them, no less eminent than the Pulpit? Sure if such Women may there speak of their sins, and tell how they have been tempted of the Devil, good Women moved by the Spirit of God may tell what God has done for them, in preserving them from such evils. Neither will it serve to say that it is not *authoritative speaking*, for the Apostle's words are, *I permit not a Woman to speak*, not *I permit her not to speak authoritatively*; for the words added, *nor to usurp authority over the man*, is a distinct precept. Women may usurp authority over their men, who never offer to preach in the Church, as also some may speak there, who may be very subject to their husbands. Besides they permit women to sing publicly, which is a speaking and actual part of God's worship. Now there is not a word in the Text of these exceptions, more than the other, and let him prove them, if he can, from the Scriptur, without making way for Womens preaching. He confesseth pag. 400. that *Women may be instrumental in conversion privately, but not publicly*; and for his saying, he will *suspect the conversion that way wrought rather to be a delusion*, he but telleth his own conjecture, that so he may conclude this chapter, according to his custom, with *Railing*.

¶ 7. Pag. 401. He begins his 21 chapter, of *Ministers Maintainance*, with a manifest perversion, insinuating as if I were joyning with such who are against Ministers maintainance, which is utterly false, as by what I say upon that subject doth evidently appear. But indeed the man contendeth here very warmly, and with might and main, and tooth and nail, as they say, albeit the thing he pleads for, as to the substantial part of it, be not denied; but it will not satisfie him to grant, as I do, that the Ministers should receive temporal things from them to whom they minister Spiritual, or that their necessities should be supplied: No, he will have it to be an *honorary*, as he calls it, and that *a large one* too, for so pag. 405. he interprets 1 Tim. 5:17, 18, as if *double honour* could not be given

given without large giving of money. It seems poor folks with him can not give *double honour*, nor fulfill this command of the Apostle; it is only the rich folks honor, who can give largely, that he regards, yea he reckons this giving liberally to Ministers a sowing to the Spirit, for so he interpreteth *Gal. 6: 8*. By all which it is manifest, that to give liberally to Ministers goeth with him for a great article of Faith: but the question only lieth betwixt us concerning a *limited and forced maintainance*, for a *sumptuous* he can not for shame but seem to disclaim, and a *necessary*, yea what in any true sense can be so called I confesse; therefore, as what he saith of our denying it, is false, so what he urgeth to prove it as to us is superfluous. As for a *constrained or forced Maintainance*, I desire him next time to prove it from Scriptur, since he has not yet done it, nor indeed can he by any thing there written, since what is there said, is only by way of such exhortation, as liberality and charity is enjoined, which albeit he saith confidently he has *convicted of falsehood*, but he hath said it, and that is all, for there were then no Christian Magistrats to limit or constrain such as would not give; the conclusions and determinations, of the Magistrate and People make it not lawfull in it self, as all that hath been given, either by Heathen or Popish Magistrats or People, out of Superstition, may be lawfull for Ministers to receive, and indeed many of them begin to call that *the Churches patrimony*, and reckon it sacrilege for others than *Church-men*, as they call them, to meddle with it. He knows not how to turn by *Paul's* exhortation to the Elders of *Ephesus*, *Act. 20: 33*. and therefore at last, after some ado, he agrees to it, but to make it have the less weight, he tels how *Paul took from other Churches*, which is not denied, but it is manifest *Paul* preferred the not taking, but working with their hands to supply their necessitys, as that which was rather to be done, else to what purpose desires he them to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, that *it is more blessed to give than to receive*? But it seems *I. B.* and his Brethren think it the most blessed thing to be getting *large augmentations*. My speaking of their complaining of the hardness of Christians indefinitely, doth not hinder exceptions, and therefore his carping at it, *pag. 409.* is frivolous. And albeit *Paul* did not plead for a *carnal Ministry*, in reasoning for Maintainance, as he saith *pag. 410.* yet it very wel follows that such are but a carnal Ministry, that will not preach without they get money, yea himself confesseth in the former page that true Minister must speak, whether they get alimant or not, and



and commendeth some for so doing. But he hath given in this *page 410.* a notable example of his sottishness and malice both together, for in answering what I say, that a carnal Ministry wanteth the Life and Power, and therefore needs a fixed maintainance, but a Spiritual Ministry can confide in God who will provide for them; to this he tels, that the Priests in the days of Iezabel were richly provided for, and the servants of God put to great straits, shall we therefore (saith he) say, that these Priests of Baal were the only called of God, sent-forth in his Power and Authority; and that the Servants of the Lord were but a carnal Ministry? This were to argue carnally with belly arguments, as our Quakers do. The sober Reader may judge of the sottishness and malicious perverseness of this answer: sottish it is, because no ways to the purpose, for I never made the being richly provided a token of a Spiritual Ministry, as the whole I say of this matter evinceth, but, on the contrary, with Christ and the Apostle I think they are most blessed who receive least. And will he say that my saying that Spiritual Ministers can depend upon God who will provide for them, so as not to need a *fixed maintainance*, infers any such thing, it is malicious, because he would insinuat to the Reader that this gross assertion were mine, affirming we argue with *belly arguments*, which is a base, but bare, calumny; how much more his arguments favour of that, the Reader may judge, and that his extream keenness in this matter shews how near of kin he is to those, *whose God is their belly, who preach for hire, and divine for money, and look for their gain from their quarter.* What he saith of the Quakers riches is both false and frivolous, for they are none of the richest People, and their Preachers, especially such as receive maintainance, are usually the poorest among them; for such as have of their own, and are called to the Ministry, do not use to receive, but following the Apostle labour to make the Gospel without charge. He turns by what I say in the conclusion of my explication of my 10 *These*, where I shew by many Scriptures the distinction betwixt a true and false Ministry, shewing how we plead for the true, and deny the false, this he calls *false, groundless and impertinent*, but he passed it so hastily, because it was too hot for his fingers, and having given it this passing sentence, he concludes with his old calumny of our being *Pagan-Preachers*, and *designing Paganish Antichristianisme.*

## Section. Twelfth,

Wherein his 22<sup>th</sup> Chapter Of the *Quakers* Silent Worship: his 23<sup>th</sup> of Preaching: his 24<sup>th</sup> of Praying: and 25<sup>th</sup> of Singing Psalmes are considered.

**N**OW followeth his 22<sup>th</sup> chapter entituled *of the Quakers silent worship*, wherein if I should return him no answer, but that of *Michaël to Lucifer the father of lyes*, I should do him no injustice, it being a heap either of manifest calumnies, gross perversions, or abusive railing; wherein, as if he were constituted judge by GOD over the *Quakers*, he concludes them over and over again to be acted and deluded by the Devil, and to be such as wholly lay themselves open to him, to possess them and work in them at his pleasur, with much more of this stuff, for which I need not particularly note pages, for the Reader will scarce look seriously unto any one of this chapter from 412. to 419. but he will find it very thick: and for a sufficient refutation of it I recommend to any sober and unprejudicat Reader, seriously to compare and read with this chapter that to which it relates, to wit, the explication of the 11<sup>th</sup> *These* in my *Apology*, which I judge may suffice to give a sufficient disgust of this chapter. But lest he should think this were too slightly a passing-over his matter, and for the Readers more full direction and satisfaction, I will propose to him to be considered these things following.

¶ 1. And first his calumnies, as pag. 411. where he saith, *I would have them understand Christ's Spiritual Resurrection was never till now*: whereas I speak only with reference to the time since the Apostasy, and not to the primitive times before. And pag. 412. he saith *We acknowledge no Motion or inward Breathing of the Spirit, but what is Extraordinary and meerly Enthusiastik*, as also that *we abstract from all means*. This is false. But as for his supposing that *studied sermons are a mean appointed of God, and that not to do it is a sure way of tempting God, and inviteing the Devil to deceive and delude*, which he affirms he has shewn; I have not seen it, and will expect that next time he will make it more manifest. His 413 page containeth a mass of calumnies, to wit, *That there is no word in our Assemblys of the Scriptur, That we apply them not for instruction, reproof, and edification of the*

the People, That the *Scriptur* is no Rule to us in our walk, nor has any place in our Worship, That there is to be found in all our solemn service neither preaching, nor prayer, nor praise. And pag. 414. he has his old reiterated calumny, that the power and life the Quakers speak of proceedeth not from the Grace of God, but is the meer operation of Nature To this purpose he hath over and over again pag. 415, 416, 417, 418. 421, & 422. He supposeth, p. 414. that it is affirmed by me, that at all times the Quakers meet, all of them are truly gathered unto the sense of the Power, and whatever any says comes from it, and is not to be questioned: which is wholly false. I shew their manner of meeting, and their duty when met, according to their principles, and the consequence thereof, when they truly perform it; but it doth not thence follow that none of them ever miss in the performance, no more than if he should relate their manner of Worship, and the good effects he may suppose it sometimes has, it would follow that whoever set about it, and got up to the pulpit, and read his Text, could not preach false doctrine, nor speak impertinently: and therefore what he builds upon this here, as also pag. 416. n. 7. pag. 517 & 429. falls to the ground. But he seeketh to uphold this with another calumny, as if all, that frequent the Quakers meetings, and are accounted of their number, were supposed by us to be perfect, asking, *how can the power of darkness work, if they be made free from sinning?* which is false. How we affirm this absolute perfection, even of such as we account our Brethren, I have shewn in my section of *Perfection*. A sixth calumny is, pag. 415. which he also hath, pag. 424. where he supposeth it to be our doctrine that there is no setting about Prayer or other duties *without a previous motion of the Spirit*, and upon this he insists as an absurdity. But we speak not of a *previous motion*, in order of time, as absolutely necessary, it is enough if it be in order of nature, which he knows may be without any priority of time; and so his absurdity upon this, pag. 424. vanisheth, which I also answer, speaking of *Prayer*, in my Apology. A seventh calumny is, p. 426. where he concludeth, because I say Gospel-Worship is not to be in outward observations, gon-about by man, in his own will and proper strength; that I affirm *Gospel worship putteth-away all external actions*, which how false it is and inconsequential, any ordinary Reader may easily judge, and yet upon this false inference he thinketh to bind upon me a contradiction, in owning afterwards external acts of Worship, for to say worship may be performed without these acts, and that worship can not be

performed in these acts, is very different: the last I deny, but own the first. An eighth calumny is, pag. 418. where because I say, that it sometimes falleth out, that one come into a meeting upon a sinistrous account may by the Power raised in the Meeting be reached, if the day of his Visitation be not expired, he concludes, *if any such come in, and be not thus changed, his day is gon, and it is impossible to him to be saved*, which is a gross abuse, for albeit the not expiring of his day must be presupposed to a capacity of Salvation, yet his not presently, yea after divers times, not being converted, doth not suppose his day to be over, since it was never our principle, to say, God affords men no opportunity but one. Besides these, there are many other perversions scatter'd up and down, such as, pag. 421. his saying that the *waiting we plead for, is such as putteth away Prayer, that we plead for it, to shut out the ordinances of Jesus Christ, and to give God no more, for all his solemn worship, but a dumb mumry*, which word pleaseth him so wel, that he hath it several times over.

¶ 2. His great and mighty charge in this chapter is indeed great enough, if he could make it out, and that is, *that the Quakers are guilty of Devilry, and are certainly acted by the Devil in their assemblys*. But this he only strongly affirms without proof, unless one, which, whether it be valid or not, comes now to be examined, and that is, pag. 418. from my saying that *there will be sometimes an inward struggling, yea so as the body will be strangely moved*: to this he adds a story of one Gilpin, long ago answered, and describeth these motions of the *Quakers* to be *foam, swell and froath at the mouth*, which is false, and returned upon him as a calumny, however he compares these motions of the body as asserted by me to *the work of the Devil, and the old Phythoniks*. But it seems malice hath wonderfully blinded the man here, else he would not have given his own cause, which he esteems *the great Cause of God*, so deep a wound; for in the book called *The Fulfilling of the Scriptures*, a treatise much applauded by them, whose author is said to be *Robert Fleeming*, one of their non-conforming Brethren, he relates as a *convincing proof of the Power of God, how some were so choaked, and taken by the heart, that they were made to fall over, and so carried out of the Church, and as a convincing appearance of God and down-pouring of the Spirit, that there was a strange and unusual motion on the hearers, which by the profane was called [the Stewarton Sicknes]* from the name of the Parish. Now what difference is betwixt this and my speaking of mens being strangely moved by the Power of God? Will not this

## Sect. XII.

## Of Silence in Worship.

r49

this prove as much that all this was *Devilry* and the *passions* of the *old Phythomiks*? Since these motions are made the great argument why the *Quakers* are said to be acted by the Devil, let him the next time assign clear reasons, according to Scriptur, why these motions upon the *Presbyterian* bodys are a convincing sign of the working of the Power of God among them, but that the motions on the *Quakers* bodys are enough to confirm they are acted by the Devil: and if he do this effectually, he may be in some hopes of gaining a profelyt. Next to this I come to consider what he urges as a great absurdity, to wit, *that the Quakers turning their minds inward* (which he will needs term *introverting*, and not interpret the word, that he may make ignorant folks believe it is a piece of the *Quakers* Devilry) and *laying-aside all their own thoughts and imaginations were a laying-aside both Christianity and humanity, a becoming no men, but brutes, and worse, and most capable to be deluded by the Devil*. Upon this he insists, pag. 414. 422. and elsewhere, as if for men to abstain from their own thoughts and imaginations were the way to unman them: yet if he will understand it of the *Old Man*, the *Man of sin*, that is *corrupted*, we will say with the Apostle, *that ought to dye and be crucified*, and are so far from thinking this is against Christianity, that we believe, according to Scriptur, it is the way to become a Christian, and to overcome the Devil, not to lay our selves open to him. And therefore his railing against man's silence from his own thoughts, that God may speak and work in him, doth evidence his great ignorance in the work of a true Christian; for this is so far from descending from humanity to brutism, that it is rather an ascending from humanity to Divinity: so that, albeit in one sense we are said to dye, or be emptied as to our selves, yet we do more truly live and exist. And if he think this a contradiction, let him consider that of the Apostle, *Gal. 2: 20. I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me*: and this if rightly considered will answer his questions, pag. 422. by answering of which he would have me clear my way of Devilry. As for any arguments in this chapter that have the least shew of solidity or weight, I have looked narrowly, but can find none, only in stead thereof he has some little nibbling quibbles and questions, which albeit they be so inconsiderable as scarce deserve the pains to answer, yet lest he may think something of them, if omitted, I will now take notice of them, and answer them; as first, pag. 412. he asketh *whether the appointing of set times and places be not a limiting of the Spirit?*

*Answer.* If it were to exclude other times and places, when God moves thereunto, it might be so judged, but other ways it is not; for meeting together is not an immediat act of worship, but a matter of outward conveniency, and therefore needs not always a particular motion. As for his desiring me in this page to answer what he has said of the *Sabbath* (the denying of which in their sense he accounteth a great error) I must wait then till he come to his matter, which he has not done in his first  *Tome*, (which I have only seen as yet) albeit it be a book about an hundred sheets of paper, and when he has written all that he can say upon that subject, I doubt whether it may not be sufficiently refuted by a few lines which *Calvin* has written thereon, *Inst. lib. 2. cap. 8. § 34.* from whom, as well as the generality of *Protestants*, I know not that I differ in this matter. *Pag. 413.* he proposeth as an exception against the manner of Worship expressed by me, that it wanteth that preparation requisite, which he accounts to be some impression of that Divine Majesty, with whom they have to do. But I see no reason why he should accuse us for want of this, since none can be more fit than such as make silence and an inward turning of the mind necessary to their entering to Worship: but if he understand this by outward Prayer, meaning this should be done first, since it is an actual part of Worship, by which we draw near to that Majesty, there would be a preparation to that, by the same rule, and another to that, and so a *progressus in infinitum*. But a godly frame of Spirit, and a studying to be found always in the sense of God's holy fear in all things, is a good general preparation to all acts of Worship. And for his crying out against Silence as that which can not edify, and thinking it so strange that Life or Vertue should be transmitted from one to another, when they do not hear one another speak, as *pag. 415. 420. 426.* what will he say to what is reported by the fore said Author of the fulfilling of the Scriptures, *pag. 432.* how Robert Bruce his Praying caused unusual motions upon those who were not in the chamber with him, nor knew the cause how that came upon them, and yet this is given as an instance of his knocking down the Spirit of God upon them, as they themselves phrase it, ? *Pag. 420.* he wondereth & asketh, how one in whom the Life doth flow, so that he might speak, yet may forbear, since that is a sufficient call? and how dare they follow their own choice? But this is a silly quibble: the flowing of Life may sometimes give ability to speak justifiably, and yet it may be no sin to forbear, since albeit it gives a sufficiency of authority, yet not a peremptory command, and



and this is no contradiction. The Apostle *John* could have written more and that no doubt from the Spirit, and yet did it not, 2 *Joh.* 12. 3 *Joh.* 13. and I suppose I. B. will not dare to say he sinned in this forbearance. He goeth about, pag. 420. n. 12. to examin the Scriptur proofs I bring for *Waiting*, and then he shews in what respect *waiting* is there understood, which nothing hurteth my using them. What if *waiting* be understood, as he saith, in opposition to *freing*? may not that be in silence? But as to this since his brother R. M. in the Postscript has promised us his answer to G. K's book called *The Way cast up*, we will wait to see what he answers to his 15 *sect.* and to the Scripturs brought by him there, to this purpose: and that he may more fully consider that matter, I recommend to him the serious perusal of G. K's book, called *the Glory and Advantage of Silent Meetings*. He alledgeth falsely, pag. 423. that I say men can not wait upon God in prayer, I say only that *Waiting* in it self rather denoteth a *passive dependence*, and that *true Prayer* presupposeth *waiting*; and that therefore their objection is frivolous, that ascribeth *waiting*, of it self, or simply considered, to such acts: but I never denied that a man in Prayer might be said also to wait. Another of his silly quibbles is, pag. 424. n. 17. where, because I say that *the Devil can only work in and by the Natural man*, for so he may be pleased to translate my words, or at least he must suffer me so to do; he saith, he thought he could also work in a *Spiritual man*, as in *Peter*, &c. But not in and by the *Spiritual man*: it was in and by the natural part both in *Peter* and *Paul* that he wrought; if he thinks not so, let him say the contrary. Pag. 425. in answer to what I say of the excellency of this Worship, as that which can not be interrupted, to prove that Christ's Kingdom needeth outward power to protect it, he telleth of the promise that *Kings shall be nursing fathers*. What then? That may be an advantage, yet it will not follow there is an absolute need for it, else Christ's Kingdom could not be without it: but indeed such a sure outward Kingdom the Priests always cover, where they may be upheld by the Magistrate, and supplied with daily augmentations, and have all others that differ from them severely persecuted; for where this is wanting, they cry out *Alas!* like *Babylons* Merchants, and think it goes not wel with their *Zion*. The rest of this page he concludes with railing; but for answer to it, he may know that the *Quakers* meetings in *Scotland*, albeit few in number, have met with more injurys from wicked men, than the *Presbyterians*, and that they never defendedh emselys with force

force of Armes against any, far less against the Magistrate, as his Brethren have don, or with shedding of Blood. As for his other quibble, pag. 427. *that ceasing to do evil is not without all action of the mind*: not to contend with him about it, I shall not plead for a further cessation, than such a simple forbearance importeth; and let him call it an action, if he will. His chief reply to what I say in answer to what they object of *Silence*, besides some scofs, is, *that what I alledg is not spoken of an inverting Silence*, for he will needs use this *Latine* word, and not translate it, but can there be any true silence, in order or with respect to the worship of God, where the eye of the mind is not inward, since the Spirit of God, by which Christians are led and instructed, is said to be within them? But pag. 424. n. 16. he saith that *watching is not a turning inward, but a looking outward also*. Indeed they, who look outward, go the way to be tempted, for outward objects is not that which delivers men from temptations, but often draws them to them. But it would seem according to him, that men, if their eyes be shut, or in a dark room, can not watch, in a Spiritual sense, and then what became of many Saints that have been put into dungeons? As to what he adds out of Dr *Stillingfleet's* book of the idolatry of the Church of Rome, and *Taulerus* sermons, which takes up about 7 whole pages, (by which the Reader may see how his book grows so bulky) he misleth his aim, for he will never prove that the first and most eminent Preachers among the *Quakers*, who both practised and commended this way of Worship, as well as thousands of them yet, did ever know that there was such a thing spoken of among *Papists*, or that there ever lived such a man as *Taulerus*. So that he but wasts his paper, in seeking to prove they have borrowed their doctrine thence: and albeit I will not justify many of the expressions used in the pages cited by him, yet I will not scruple to affirm that some of them favour more of Christianity, than his lyes, calumnys, and railings.

¶ 3. He begins his 23<sup>th</sup> chapter of *Preaching*, that he may be like himself, with a calumny, saying, *I have something against Preaching, Praying and Singing*, which is false. I am against none of those duties, as truly performed according to the right Gospel method, as by the sequel will appear. And that he may go on at the same rate, he seems to be glad that I acknowledge the necessity of *Worships* being consonant to Scriptur; but then, that he may not want something to cavill, he entertains me to reconcile this with what I say of the *Scripturs*: but he should

should first have shewn me wherein the difference is, for I profess I see none. He desires also to know from Scriptur the necessity, when men are met together, of turning their minds inward, which he still will express, to make it the more frightfull, by the Latine word *Introversio*; and this he thinks so hard, that he often insists upon it, as pag. 446, 447, 448. But is it not needfull to assemble in the Name of Jesus? And can that truly be without turning the mind inward? unless with superstitious *Papists* he thinks it is enough, for meeting in the Name of Jesus, to say, when they begin, *In Nomine Domini*, however their minds be abroad. Can there be any true sense of God's Majesty, as him to whom we draw near, which himself confest before to be needfull, without a serious turning of the mind inward, that is, an abstracting from all worldly and vain thoughts, to mind GOD and the operations of his Spirit in the Soul? Let him read *Psalms* 46:14. & 62:1. *Ecclesi.* 5:2. *Zach.* 2:3. It were hard for him to forget his old often reiterated calumny, and therefore he hath it here often than once, as pag. 441, 442-447. alledging most fallly, that all that, by which the Quakers preach, or require as needfull to preach, is but the dimme and darkned and malignant Light of Nature: neither will he forget here his constant trade of Railing, take one instance, pag. 447. where he sayes, that, before I want revelations, I will go to the Devil to get them, as Saul did to the Witch of Endor. More of such railing stuff the Reader may find, and that very plentifully, pag. 440-442-448. He wants not here also his malicious insinuations, as pag. 439. that the Quakers use legerdemaine, to make People believe they speak all without a previous thought in their Preaching, and yet have all, to a word, wel studied. If he accuse the Quakers of this, let him prove it, if he can, for we deny it as a gross calumny. Another is, pag. 441. That we would have all study, all meditation, all Prayer, and wrestling with God in Prayer laid aside, which is also false. But to proceed, he foundeth what he saith in this matter upon two great mistakes, which being removed, the superstructure will fall of it self. The first is, pag. 438. where, to prove the usefulness of study and premeditation to Preaching, he tels how Paul made use of what he had read out of a Heathen Poet, his recommending reading to Timothy, his desiring Titus to hold fast the faithfull Word, as he had ben taught, &c. and Apollos being instructed by Aquila and Priscilla: all which are nothing to his purpose, for we never said it was unlawfull for men to read books, especially the Scriptur, or that by such reading men may

not acquire knowledge, which may prove usefull in Preaching or defending the Truth; but the question is Whether men may make use of these things in publik Worship, otherwise than as led and acted and influenced by the Spirit so to do? and Whether any of these places will allow men to preach in the strength of their natural or acquired parts, without being acted therein by the Spirit? Let him prove this, if he can, for this is the matter in question; and remember *Robert Bruce* his censur of *Robert Blair* his sermon recorded in the fulfilling of the Scriptures. His second mi stake is, pag. 443. where he supposeth that to be led by the Spirit excludeth, or is inconsistent with, reading Scriptur, and with all the particular instructions given by *Paul* to *Timothy* and *Titus*, who might have said, as this man argues, *I can not be stilled unto these doctrines, which you desire me to put the brethren in remembrance of; for I must speak as the Spirit speaketh in me*, and the like. But will he say, that *Timothy* was not to speak as the Spirit spake in him? To suppose this, as inconsistent with such instructions, is to beg the question; and that these are consistent, I have shewn above in my third section of *Immediat Revelation*: or let him tell plainly, if *Timothy* could do those things acceptably without the Spirit, since all worship is commanded by *Christ* to be done now in the Spirit. And yet he seemeth to agree to the necessity of the Spirit, else why quarreleth he me, pag. 448. for insinuating, as he saith, that *their Ministers preach not in the demonstration of the Spirit?* giving an enumeration, pag. 439. of several ways which he saith, I know not, but their Ministers are led to preach by, among which this is one, *What know I (saith he) but there may be some, that never digest their preachings so, as not to lye open to the influences of the Spirit, and to welcome his seasonable and usefull suggestions, and so speak many things, which they had not once premeditated?* But I would ask him Whether it be lawfull for any so to digest their matter, as not to lie thus open to the Spirit's influences? He would seem to say it were, since it is but some, and a may be some too, with him, that do so. And whereas he tels of some, that are constrained to change their text, and what they had purposed to speak upon it, this shews the case is but rare, and therefore I am not to be blamed for what I say in general of Preachers among *Papists* and *Protestants*, whose general way is to prepare aforehand what they preach, and then speak it to the People at a set hour, without waiting for the leading of the Spirit, or whether they have its influence or not. And for all the weight that this man would seem to lay sometimes upon the Spirit's influence

fluence and concurrence, yet he gives shrewd presumptions that he doth it but *pro forma*, else how comes he to urge as an absurdity, *pag. 445. that all that Ministers preach by the Spirit must be true?* And why not? If it be from the Spirit, it can not be other ways; yet men, whose principle it is to speak from the Spirit, may through weakness and mistake preach false doctrine; yet the Spirit is not to be blamed for it, but those who keep not purely to it. I suppose he will not deny, but all that, which men preach according to the Scriptur, is infallibly true, it will not thence follow, that all that, which men, whose principle it is to preach according to Scriptur, preach, is true, because that through weakness they may mistake the true meaning of the Scriptur. Also what he adds, *if the matter be thus, it is all one whether the Preacher be young or old, — for it is not he that speaks, but the Spirit in him*, for this savoureth not of a Christian Spirit, to seek to draw an absurdity or make a mock of that which is no other than Christ's express words, *Matth. 10: 20. Mark 13: 3.* and indeed what he saith in this page, N. 9. in answer to these Scriptures, seemeth rather a mock at Christ & his Apostles, than any answer, asking me *if I know not that Christ gave them their Preaching with them, telling them what they should say, And as ye go, preach, saying, The Kingdom of God is at hand.* And a little after he saith, they had their sermon taught them beforehand. But dare he say, that Christ's words, before mentioned, were therefore false? This he must say, or else prove nothing. Or will he say that the Apostles in all that progress said nothing but these seven words *The Kingdom of God is at hand?* For, according to him, this was all they said, which they had learned aforehand, and not as the Holy Ghost taught them in that hour what to say, albeit it be Christ's express words *Luk 12: 12.* *Pag. 447.* to my argument that according to their doctrine the Devil himself ought to be heard, seeing he knoweth the notion of Truth, and excelleth many of them in learning and eloquence; he answers, *Why doth the man thus speak untruth? Do we say that every one, though he were the Devil, if he speak truth, should be heard?* Do they not say, that men ought to be heard and accounted as Ministers, albeit void of the true Grace of God, if having the formality of the outward call? And to prove this, do not they bring the example of *Judas*, whom Christ called a *Devil*? And they suppose him to have been such, even when sent by Christ, & deserved to be heard as his Apostle. Let him consider then how he can shun what I have affirmed. And albeit the Devil may speak with-

out study, yet he can not be said to speak by the Spirit of God, which is the thing we affirm needfull to Gospel preaching. And for his last argument, pag. 448. *that, since extraordinary gifts ceased, there hath been no ordinary way of preaching but by ordinary gifts studied and acquired*; it is but a bare begging of the question, and the same upon the matter with his new enforced objection which I answered towards the beginning of my third section of *Immediat Revelation*.

¶ 4. I come now to his 14th chapter of *Prayer*, and as to his first paragraph, there needs no debate, for (except some railing intermixed) I own what is asserted in it, as to the necessity of Prayer, and its being through Christ as Mediator. In the next he alledgeth I speak untruly in saying *that the acts of their Religion are produced by the strength of the natural will, for they can pray when they please*: but how truly this is affirmed concerning them will after appear, albeit in opposition to it, after citing a passage out of the larger Catechism, he saith, *they owne the influences of the Spirit as absolutely necessary to this duty*; which if he would hold to, there needed no further debate, I should agree to it, for he doth untruly state the question, when he saith a little after, *that the motions and inspirations I plead for are extraordinary*, which is false, and never said by me: and therefore his building on it is in vain, as well here, as pag. 452-457-459. 461. where he insinuates *that I judge not the gracious and ordinary influences of the Spirit a sufficient warrant to pray*, which is false. What he saith, pag. 451. *of the necessity of Prayer* at some times, and of the Scriptures mentioning Prayers being made three times a day, I deny not, nor is it to the purpose. The question is Whether any can pray acceptably without the Spirit? We see he hath granted they can not, then the thing to be proved, is, Whether the general command authorizeth any to set about it, albeit in a manner, which is granted, will not avail, and is unacceptable. So the matter resolves in examining what he can say from Scripture or other ways, to prove this: and that there may be no mistake, let it be considered, that I deny not the general obligation to pray upon all, so that they, who do not pray, sin, albeit they be not sensible of the Spirit's help enabling them to do it; but that the way to avoid this sin is not to commit another, to pray without the Spirit, but to wait for the Spirit; that they may pray acceptably, seing without it, though they should use words of Prayer, it would be no fulfilling of the command. And first then to what he argueth pag. 452. from the reiterated commands of God



to pray, I answer, that God's command lays upon man an obligation to pray I deny not, but God commands no man to pray unacceptably, God commands the right performance of Prayer, and this he has confessed can not be *without the Spirit*, therefore God commands no prayer without the Spirit, neither is the command answered or fulfilled by such as pray without it. To this he objecteth, *pag. 453 & 458. that the same Moral duty might be shifted, untill the Spirit lead to them, and also natural acts of sleeping, eating, &c. which are abomination in the wicked*: & yet, to go round, he accueth me, *p. 454.* albeit falsly, of saying *Men may pray without the Grace of God*, which by this objection is his own *faith*, since he will not deny but men may *sleep & eat* without the Grace of God. But to this objection I answered in my Apology, shewing the difference betwixt these acts and acts of Worship, which he grants, *pag. 461.* and albeit I confess, which he urgeth here, that these profit not the man at all, as with respect to God's favor, when done without the Spirit, yet they really fulfill the matter of the thing commanded in relation to our neighbours and to our selves, in eating, drinking, sleeping, else it would be self-murder. But in Prayer the matter is not fulfilled without the Spirit, which relateth only to God, to whom every prayer without the Spirit is an evil favour, and not in any true and proper sense a Prayer; for Prayer, as to the *material* part, can not be performed without the Spirit. He confesseth, according to their Catechism, *that the Spirit is needfull to know what to pray for*, which is the material part, but the necessity of the Spirit as to these other things is only as to the *formal* part, or *right manner*. And this pleading for Praying from these natural acts shews how he contradicts himself, in saying, *it is untrue that they are for Prayer without the Spirit*; for if they be not, this argument were impertinent, which is, as these ought to be done without the Spirit, so ought the other. And yet he more manifestly contradicts this, *pag. 456.* saying, *that God requireth not men to feel the influences of the Spirit, as a preparation to Prayer, yea that men ought to pray, even when, and because, they feel they want them*; for if it be true that he said before, *that these influences are necessary to the right performance of Prayer*, either men ought to perform prayer wrong, or this must be a manifest contradiction: but since this manner of Prayer is owned really in their praying at set times, whether they have the Spirit's influence or not, it shews I spake no untruth of them, and that his saying so was untruly said by him. And hence also the man's impudence may be seen, *pag. 460.* in saying, *I am a lyar in*

*affirm-*

*affirming they profess they may pray without the Spirit, and have their set times.* But the thing I say, is, that they limit themselves so, as to lay a necessity upon themselves to pray at set times, as before and after Sermon, and before and after meat, and this he can not deny, or if he should, there universal practice would declare him a liar. And if they pray at set times, and that professedly, without waiting for the *Spirit's influence*, yea when they are sensible they want it, do not they profess to pray without the Spirit? What he saith here and elsewhere, that this was the opinion of *Swenkfeldius* and the *Familists*, is not to the purpose; for what we believe in this, we do it as being the Truth, and not with respect to such, of whose belief we take no notice, so as to make it any ground for our faith. And to shew how impertinent this classing us with others is, to render us odious upon every occasion, I may tell him here once for all, that even as to this very thing of Prayer he agrees against us with *Papists*, *Sacrinians*, *Pelagians*, *Episcopalians*, *Independents*, *Anabaptists*, *Lutherans*, *Arminians*, *Antinomians*, yea and with *Pagans*, *Turks* and *Jews*; all which affirm with him, that men may and ought to pray at certain times and upon certain occasions, albeit not having any present motions or influence of the Spirit of God so to do.

¶ 5. What he saith here in several places of *Introversion*, I refer to to what is said before, to avoid repetition. It might have been thought that in this chapter of *Prayer*, and where he urges it so much from the general command, that he would have minded it would have been more futeable to pray for such, as he may account his enemies, and even heretiks, than rail at them. But the treating upon this subject has had no such inference with him, and therefore he is sure to keep here his old stile of railing, which the Reader may observe, pag. 452-456-459, 460, 461. He hath divers little cavils and quibbles in this chapter, which I willingly omit, as not concerning the weight of the question, only to give the Reader a tast of them, I shall note one or two. Pag. 455. upon these words *sub degustationem* he fancies the *Quakers* hold a state of Prayer distinct both from publik and privat. But if he had not been very critical, and ready to catch, albeit he omits more weighty things, he had not troubled himself with this, which is an error either of the Transcriber or Printer, for it is in my copy, *ad cibum*, meaning the prayers before and after meat, and that the other word doth also signify. The next is his asking what I mean by *ejaculations emitted to man's self*, and  
this

*this he saith looks like a piece of Quaker-idolatry.* This shews the man's eagerness to stretch every thing to make an accusation, for by this I intended nothing, but to express such prayers as men make unheard of others. And if this be a piece of Quakers idolatry, it is such as he must account the Apostle Paul guilty of as well as I, whose words are 1 Cor. 14: v. 28. *ταυτο δι αυτου, sibiipso loquatur, let him speak to himself,* as both *Arias Montanus & Beza* translate it, as well as the *English*: & that this is understood of Prayer see from verse 24. So the furious man may see whither his malice hath driven him. He forgetteth not also in this chapter his old calumny, & therefore hath it here oftner than once, that as all the rest, *so the prayers of the Quakers as well as preparations thereunto come only from that Light of Nature,* as pag. 455, 456, 457. and hence he accuseth me of *Pelagianism*, 459. for saying that to command a man to pray without the Spirit is to command him to see without eyes, and work without hands, because *Pelagius* said, that *whatever God commanded us to do, he gave us sufficient strength to do it.* But if *Pelagius* said so, he understood it of an ability without the Spirit of God, for which the *Antients* condemned him: whereas my very assertion here is in as opposit terms to that, as any thing can be, since I argue that a man can no more pray without the Spirit, than he can see without eyes. And indeed all this man's reasoning in this chapter favours strongly of *Pelagianism*, where he pleads throughout for mens setting about Spiritual dutys, *without the Spirit*; yea pag. 463. he saith, *that the Divine indulgence towards such as have begun to pray without the Spirit, and afterwards have found it assisting them in their prayer, is a strong inducement and encouragement to them.* For this agrees exactly to the *Semipelagian* principle, *facienti quod in se est Deus non denegat gratiam*, i. e. *God will not deny Grace to such as do what they can.* And indeed this allowing men to perform Spiritual dutys without the allowance of the Spirit, as this man doth, pleading for it, and reckoning the contrary absurd, pag. 453. is compleat *Pelagianism*, and doth clearly import, that man by the working of Nature can acquire the Spirit, and can do something in order to obtaining the Spirit, of himself, before he have it: and thence this man pleads so much, pag. 451. for the general use of Prayer, from the *Light and Law of Nature*, let him reconcile this, if he can, with his other doctrines, and clear himself of *Pelagianism*. And it is so much the more considerate, that he has fallen into this pit, of which he so often falsely accuseth me, as also pag. 461. He asketh again, pag. 460. why we come to their

their places of Worship, if our Conscience be hurt in joining with them, and thence he concludes, *it is to do open contempt*. This is but his malicious conjectur: we come not there but in obedience to the Lord, when moved by his Spirit so to do, to bear a faithfull testimony against all superstition and will-worship; for it is not pleasant to us to come there, where for the most part we are saluted with knocks and stones and other such brutish and Paganish dealings by their Church Members, which is the fruit of their holy things, and whereunto the People are often encouraged by their Preachers, who sometimes shew an example of this themselves, and of whose barbarous actions even by the *Presbyterian Preachers* there is a book extant, entituled, *of Fighting Priests*, giving account how many of them fell upon these innocent servants of the Lord with their own hands; and I myself have seen of the present Preachers of *Scotland* do it. As for his flouting at the *Quakers*, for laying claim to a Spirit of *discerning*, so as to distinguish who pray from the Spirit, and who not, he doth but therein declare himself to be none of Christ's sheep, who are said to know his voice from that of a stranger. And as for his saying that the *Quakers* judge of this by the *mimical postur of the body*, it is false, and would agree far rather to his Brethren, whose affected posturs of body, as wel as their nonsensical and absurd expressions in Prayer have disgusted many of their way, of which I could give some eminent instances, but that I spare them at present. The example I gave of their exeluding some from their *Sacrament of the Supper*, so called, doth not halt, as he affirmeth, *pag. 462.* as to the main, for if the command to take it, is with presupposition of examination, so the command of praying is with the presupposition of its being in the Spirit, in which all Worship is now to be, *Praying al ways --- in the Spirit, Eph. 6: 18.* To my shewing, in answer to their objection of *Peter* his commanding *Simon Magus* to pray, that he sayes *repent and pray*, after a meer assertion without proof, he sayes, *he sees, that with our Quaker, a graceless person can repent, but not pray.* To which I answer, if he speak of possibility, I believe a graceless person may both repent and pray, but as he can not repent without Grace, so not pray without the Spirit; but Grace worketh in all, if not resisted, as the Spirit doth in all to Prayer, when they have received the Grace in measur: but that some measur of repentance must go before prayer, himself I judge will hardly deny, since the very offering to pray importeth, in the person applying himself thereunto, a sense

sense of his iniquity, and a desire to be delivered from it, for which end he approacheth to God to demand pardon and help to amend.

¶ 6. Now I come to his 25<sup>th</sup> chapter of *Singing Psalmes*, where I shall not need to be large: I deny not, as he observs, singing, but to justify their custom of singing *David's* conditions, by which many are made (as I observed in my Apology) to speak lyes, in the presence of God. He objecteth the *practice* of the *Jews*: But their practice in matters of Worship, without a Gospel precept, is not a rule to us. Neither doth the instance given by him of *Psal. 66: 6.* answer the matter, for the *Jews* might very wel praise the Lord for the deliverance of their fore-fathers out of *Egypt*, but that will not allow Drunkards and impenitent persons to say, *They water their couch with tears*, as by singing Psalmes many do, which is false. As for his saying, *they do bus praise God for what he hath done for others*, why do they not expresse it to then? And whereas he asketh, *whether the Spirit inspireth the meter in the song, and the tone of the singing?* he sheweth his folly and lightness, while he ridiculously supposeth that *Meter* is necessar, or any other *Tone*, than Nature hath given to every one, of which God by his Spirit maketh use as an instrument, as he doth of other parts and facultys of the body, to the performing of Spiritual duties. And the like folly he sheweth when he tels what they do not in *Scotland*, since he knows it was not particularly or only against the things practised in *Scotland* that I write in that Apology.

### Section Thirteenth,

Wherein his 26<sup>th</sup> Chapter Of *Baptisme* is considered.

¶ 1. **O**Ur Author, to shew how angry and froward he resolves to be in this chapter, makes his first paragraph a compleat stick of railing; he begins with telling, that *the Paganish Antichristian Spirit, which reigneth and rageth in the Quakers, manifesteth a perfect and compleat hatred at all the Institutions of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and he endeth with this exclamation, *O! what desperat Runagadoes must these men be?* More of this kind may be seen, pag. 472, 473, 474, 480, 481. As for what he adds from several Scriptures of Baptisme, pag. 466, 467. what of it relates to the weight of the question will be examined afterwards. He gives us here a citation out of their larger *Catechism*, and then

W

comes

comes at last, pag. 468. n. 4. to examin what I say in the matter, where upon my urging the many contests among Christians concerning these things called *Sacraments*, as one reason against them, he concludes, *I might as well plead against all Christianity, because of the many debates about it*: and with this conceit he pleaseth himself a little, which only evidenceth his malicious *genius*, for I should never have used that as an only argument, and did not use it at all, but as having many other considerable ones against their use of these things, and therefore I add *that these things contended for are meer shadows and outward things*. Then to cover their making use of the word *Sacrament*, which is not to be found in Scriptur, he objecteth my making use of the word *fermentation*, and of the *Vehicle of God*: but I use not to make use of these words, when I speak *Scots* or *English*, but these words, when interpreted are made use of in Scriptur, for the Latine *fermentum*, which signifies *leaven*, is oft used, even as compared to Spiritual things, as *Matth. 13 : 31. Luk 13 : 21. 1 Cor. 5 : 6, 7, 8.* yea the word *leaven* and *leavened* is to be found in Scriptur above 30 times, but the word *Sacrament* never so much as once; and it is not (as he saith) *a poor thing to challenge* them for expressing the chief mysteries of their Religion in words that can not be found in all the Scriptur, while they affirm it to be the only adequate Rule of their faith and manners. That we deny the thing truly imported by the *Trinity* is false. As for the word *Vehiculum Dei* as having a respect to Christ's Body or Flesh and Blood from heaven, that it is a Scriptur word, see *Cant. 3 : 9. King Solomon made unto himself a chariot of the wood of Lebanon.* and *Y. 10. Vehiculum ejus purpureum*, the Hebrew words for *Chariot* and *Vehiculum* are *אפריון* *appirion* and *מרכב* *merkabb* or *merkaba*, both which signify a *chariot* and *vehicle*, and that by *Solomon* is mystically understood *Christ*, of whom *Solomon* was a figur, or type, none who are spiritually minded can deny, and consequently that this *chariot* or *vehicle* must be mystically and spiritually understood: nor can it be meant of *Believers* or the church, because it is said, *the midst of it being paved with love for the Daughters of Jerusalem*, i. e. for *Believers*, so that they are received by Christ into this chariot or vehicle, and therefore not it, but distinct, as the contained is distinct from the containing. But for the further understanding of these Hebrew words, see *Buxtorf* his *Hebrew lexicon*, and the book called *Apparatus in lib. Sohar. part. 1. p. 144. & 553.* And however he might cavill upon this mystical meaning, yet the word is Scriptural, which their bar-



baptism *Sacrament* is not. And to his saying (in answer to my shewing that by laying aside this unscriptural term, the contest of the number of the *Sacraments* will vanish) that it will remain, if instead of *Sacrament* they use *Signes or Seals of the Covenant*, this is but his bare assertion, untill he prove by clear Scriptur that there are only *two signes or seals of the Covenant*, which he will find hard, and yet harder that these two are they. Pag. 469. n. 5. he denieth the Scriptur saith, *there is one onely Baptisme*, intancing the baptism of *Affliction*. But I speak here of the Baptisme of Christ, in a true and proper sense, and *Eph. 4: 5.* will prove as much *that there is one onely Baptisme*, as there is one onely God, which is in the next verse. But before I proceed any further, I must desire the Reader to observe how this man, speaking of the *Baptisme* of the Holy Ghost, understands it only to relate to the extraordinary gift of speaking with tongues, which the Apostles had, and not as any thing common to all true and really regenerated Christians: so that he concludes the Baptism with the Spirit and with Fire now to be ceased. And upon this his supposition he buildeth, pag. 471-473, 474-478. without so much as offering to prove it. And to this he addeth a gross lye upon me, pag. 472. *that I will have none to be baptized in the Spirit but such as are endued with these extraordinary gifts*, which I never said nor believed; and therefore this his false supposition I deny, & consequently till next time that he take leasur to prove it, all that he builds thereupon is merely precarious, and needs no further answer. *John* the *Baptist* speaking of the Baptisme of Christ in general, as contradistinct from his, saith, *He that cometh after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire*, which could not have been the mark of distinction, if this had only been restricted to what the Apostles received the day of *Pentecost*, and not of the Baptisme wherewith Christ baptizeth all his Children. But to rectify the mistake he supposeth I am in, concerning the *One Baptisme*, he tels me, *the One Baptism comprehendeth both the outward element and the thing represented and sealed thereby*: but the reasons he gives for this are so weak, that thereby I am confirmed I am not in a mistake. *I might say* (saith he) *there were two Circumcisions, because Circumcision is called Circumcision of the heart*. And what then? In that sense there were two, so long as the outward continued, to wit, the outward and the inward, that of the *Flesh* and that of the *Heart*; and if he can answer this no better than by *smiling* at it, we must pitty the levity of his Spirit, but not be moved by the weight of such

airy arguments. What he addeth of the *Object of Faith*, being called *faith* as also the profession, albeit the Apostle say there is one *faith*, is not to the purpose, since these are included in the one true *faith* the Apostle speaketh of; but for him to say that the *baptisme of water* is included in the One Baptism, spoken of there by the Apostle, is only to beg the question: and yet all he doth is strongly to affirm this, without proof, so that all that he saith in answer to me being built upon this and such like mistakes needed in strictness no more reply, as his answer to my argument, pag. 471. sheweth, where he supposeth *two Baptismes*, one administered by Men, another administered by Christ himself by his Spirit, and not by men. But he should have proved this, ere he had used it as a distinction, and till he do so, my argument, to wit, *That since such as were baptized with Water were not therefore baptized with the Baptisme of Christ, therefore Water-Baptisme cannot be the Baptism of Christ*, will stand for all his blowing. I desire the Reader take notice here of his insinuation, as if I had borrowed this argument from *Socinus*, which he hath over and over again afterwards, as to others, speaking expressly, pag. 433 of my *stealing arguments from Socinus*. But to shew him how unhappy he is in being so apt to speak untruth, he may understand that I never read three lines of *Socinus's* writings hitherto, nor knew what arguments he used, till now he informs me, in case his information be true. In stead of answer to what I urge from 1 Pet. 3: 21. in my Apology he giveth a preaching made up of meer assertions built on the former mistakes, and railing; his answer is built upon the supposing that *water baptism* goes to the making up of *Christ's Baptisme*, which is now to continue, which yet remains for him to prove; and on the other hand supposing that I affirm that by the answer of a *good Conscience* there mentioned is to be understood the *extraordinary gifts of the Spirit*, which is false. And upon the same two mistakes he grounds his answer, pag. 473. n. 8. to what I urge from Gal. 3: 27. and Col. 2: 12, as a supplement, that the *putting-on of Christ*, there mentioned by the Apostle, may be understood of *putting-on Christ by profession, though not in truth and reality*, which he also hath, pag. 438. for which exposition I shall expect his proof next time, if he have any.

¶ Pag. 474. He proceedeth upon the same unproved supposition, that *Water-Baptisme was instituted by Christ*, and here he denies that *John's*

baptisme was a figure. But since *Iohn's* baptisme was a washing with water, and that the Apostle ascribeth the putting-on Christ to the baptism of Christ, as washing with water typifieth or signifies the *washing of Regeneration*, so doth *Iohn's* baptisme that of Christ. He concludeth this paragraph with a silly quibble, where, in answer to my urging *Iohn's* words, saying, *I must decrease, and he must increase*, he adds, *as if Iohn and Baptisme with Water were all one, and Christ one and the same with the Baptisme of the Holy Ghost*. Poor man! he has been fore pinched, when he betook himself to this silly shift. Will he say this is to be understood of *Iohn's* and *Christ's* Persons, and not of their Ministry? Then we must suppose *Iohn* grew less and decrepit as to his person ever after this, and *Christ* grew bigger and taller; let him remember to prove this, when he writes next. He goes on, pag. 475. upon his old mistake, supposing that Water-baptism was instituted by Christ, and that he gave command to his Disciples so to baptize, and that *Mat. 28: 19* is to be understood of water-baptisme, all which is meerly to beg the question. He saith that to say *Iohn's baptisme is not pure and Spiritual, or that it is a Legal rite, is to condemn Iohn, Christ and his Apostles, because God gave Iohn an expresse command for it*. And what then? God commanded the Legal rites also, that did not hinder them from being such, to say he needed not such a command. If it had of the nature of the Legal rites, is but a presumptuous quarrelling with God, seing on all hands it is granted he commanded it, and a meer affirming it is not such, instead of proving of it. As for the Apostle his making honorable mention of Baptisme in his Epistles, and of its ends, which he points in several Scriptures; all which is granted, but it doth not thence follow, that all this is to be understood of Water-baptisme, and while that still remaineth the thing in debate, he can prove nothing from these Scriptures. But it is no wonder he thus forgets himself here as to me, since in the following words he quareleth with the Apostle Paul, saying in answer to his words, *1 Cor. 1: v. 17. that he was not sent to baptize; if Paul had not been sent to baptize, why would he have done it?* I think it needless to me to answer the absurdity he would here fix upon the Apostle, since it sufficeth me, and I hope will other good Christians, that the Apostle saith positively, that *he was not sent to baptize*: and for his baptizing of some, we will suppose he had a reason, though not from his commission, which he expressly denies, whatever *Iohn Brown* may brawle to the contrary. As for his saying,

that it seemeth then the other Apostles had another commission than Paul had, it is built upon the supposition that they had a commission to baptize with water, which remains for him yet to prove. And not to contend with him for brevity's sake about that of *Hosea 6: 6.* whether [not] there be only to be understood of less principally, yet though it were, it would not follow, it should be so understood here also; I shew him by an example, *1 Cor. 2: 5.* what wild work such an interpretation would make, if ordinarily applied: but he it seems judged it most convenient not to take notice of it in this his *Examen*, albeit in reason he should have done it, if he would give a compleat answer, for he must either prove [not] always to be understood of *less principally*, or otherwise he must bring particular reasons why it should be so here, and not that it sometimes is so understood, for such a Particular will not infer the consequence.

¶ 3. The reason he giveth of Christ's submitting to water-baptisme to prove it now to continue, is, his saying, *for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness.* But may not that be applied also to *Circumcision*, and yet its continuance will not thence follow? John's receiving a Divine command to baptize, sheweth there was a Divine institution for it, under the Law, because the Law was not as yet abrogated, nor the Legal ministration accomplished, till Christ was offered up. As for Christ his consecrating it in his own person, the like may be also said of *Circumcision*. I come now to see what he saith, *n. 14.* to prove *Matth. 28: 19.* to be understood of *Water-baptisme*, and first, after a little railing, he saith, *This was but an enlargement of their former Commission, as to the Object, And before this we heard of their baptizing with Water, with Christ's warrant and authority, &c.* *Ans.* We have heard him say so indeed, but must wait untill he prove, ere we be so forward as to believe it: And next, what if it were all granted? we heard before of the Disciples preparing and eating the *Passover* with Christ's warrant and authority, will it thence follow that that practice is still to continue in the Church? (2.) Because it is joynd here with *Discipling*, and baptizing was the way of making Disciples among the *Jews*. So was *Circumcision* and that no less constantly and necessary, will it therefore follow that *circumcision* is to continue? (3.) He saith, *Their constant after-practice declareth this to be the meaning of the Command.* But the Apostle Paul's practice and testimony declareth this to be false. (4.) He saith, *This is the proper import of the word.* But

I deny it is so in Scriptur, since we see no necessity in most of the places of Scriptur to understand the word of *Water-baptisme*; and when he shews the necessity, he may be answered, and the Scriptures so frequently using it, where *Water* upon all hands is confessed not to be understood, prove this to be true. And as for his saying, that it can not be understood here of Baptisme with the Spirit, it falleth to the ground, because only built upon the supposition that that is only understood of extraordinary gifts. He urgeth Christ's saying, *Luk. 12: 50. I have a baptisme to be baptized with, and how am I straitned till it be accomplished?* as if this were to be called Christ's own baptisme; and so I shall grant it, with a respect to his Personal Sufferings: but when I speak of Christ's own baptisme, I speak of that which is his, as being instituted by him for others, and that contradistinct from John's. *Pag. 479.* He saith, the words of *baptizing into the Name, εις το ὄνομα*, is only to be understood of a dedicating to God, and not a being baptized into the Power and Vertue. But this is his own assertion, neither doth Paul's saying, *1 Cor. 1: 13. were ye baptized in the Name of Paul* make it clear at all, for making it unto Paul will render the Apostle's argument more forcible, to shew the *Corinthians* their folly, in saying they were of Paul or other men, into whose power or vertue it was absurd to say they were baptized; as must be said of all true Christians, being baptized into the Name of Christ. That I condemn their manner of baptizing is true, but that I do it because of their doing it in the Name of the Father, is his false and foolish conjectur; and therefore his troubling himself to prove that, is to no purpose. For his saying, that, if *Matth. 28: 19.* be not understood of *Water-baptisme*, it would make a tautology; I answered that (*n. 8.*) in my Apology of Baptisme, and here he only repeats the objection, without taking notice of my answer: which sheweth how defective his *Examen* is. He goes on, *pag. 480.* upon the supposition, that the Apostle's baptizing with *Water* was not by meer permission, and yet the Apostle's commanding the Gentiles to abstain for a time from things strangled and from blood, which was a Jewish rite, shews their using baptisme with *Water* doth not prove it Evangelical. He confesseth here they did not fully at first comply with their commission, and he must also say they did not understand it, though he would here wave it; and because he knows not wel what to say, he falls to rail, saying, he seeth *What Quakers can not do with reason, they must do with confident and bold lyes.* But the reason he gives of all this

accusation, so strange confidence, is my saying that the chief of Christ's Disciples had been John's, adding, *Will he tell us, who these Chiefs were?* Yes I will, seeing he is so ignorant, *Joh. 1: 35-37.* where he may see two of John's disciples followed Christ, one of which is expressly mentioned to be *Andrew* the Apostle, and it is there clearly enough imported that *Peter* was another, and such may without absurdity be accounted among the chief of Christ's Disciples. *Pag. 481.* He most falsely saith that I condemn *Peter* and all the Apostles for resting satisfied with what he had done. His saying here, *that they do not urge their baptism from Peter's baptizing Cornelius*, shews he sees a necessity of not laying great stress upon that: but for his adding, that *Jesus Christ hath commanded*, he doth but say and not prove it. He saith that *Gal. 2: 12.* will not prove that Peter constrained the Gentiles to be circumcised: but *verse 14.* to which my words alluded, saith expressly, --- *why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?* and sure that was to be circumcised. For his malicious false asseveration, *that we with the Jews designe to destroy Christianity*; it needs no proof, that there were baptisines among the Jews is clear from *Heb. 6: 2.* albeit *Paulus Riccius* were not alledged to prove it, nor any debate used about the antiquity of the Jews writings; but that some of them wrot before the year 200, *Iosephus's* history is an example. He confesseth the etymology of the word inferreth *dipping*, and albeit we deny not that, yet this sheweth with how little reason he urgeth that etymology upon us: if the Reader will but seriously read what I have written in my Apology, of Baptism, he will easily find how slender his answer is, albeit I had not written this reply.

#### Section Fourteenth,

Wherein his 27<sup>th</sup> Chapter, entituled, *Of the Lord's Supper*, is considered.

**T**HE Reader before this time hath had so much opportunity to discern the temper of this man's spirit, that he need not wonder to find him begin this chapter, *of the Lord's Supper*, with an heap of Railing, accounting us such as overturn Christianity, and introduce *Paganisme*, yea as are posting towards it. And then having given a large account, *pag. 48, 484.* of their *Confession of Faith* and larger



*Catechism*, pag. 485. he comes to tell of the good experiences many have had by their use of this *Supper*, which to make strong in his conceit, he useth a continued stile of railing against us, as men only led by our own imaginations, & given up to the working of the Prince of darkness: and thus he goes on. But such experience, albeit granted, will not prove the necessity of its continuance; for the *Assembly of Divines*, so called, in their Preface to the *Directory*, do speak of the good which was experienced by the *Liturgy* of the Church of *England*, and of the religious intentions of the Compilers of it, while yet they are rejecting & abolishing it, as that which proved an offence to the godly, and occasioned much mischief. Therefore that is no Argument. *Pag. 486. n. 5.* He comes to examin what I say in the matter, and then, after a reference to his 10th chapter, he has his old calumny that the *Celestial Seed and Spiritual Substance* is nothing but the *dimms light of Nature*; he falleth into a new fit of Railing, which holds him to the end of this paragraph, terming us such as are *judicially blinded and deluded, acted and driven by the Devil into a profane and Paganish contradiction to the ways of Grace.* And with the like shame, and upon the same old supposition of our exalting the Light of Nature, which is most false, he falleth his *n. 6.* and also his 7. *pag. 488.* For what he saith there of the absurdity of *God's revealing himself to Heathens*, or such as were *Idolaters*, I have spoken before, writing upon that subject: and here he concludes that *my asserting of a Spiritual body and flesh of Christ, at one blow, is a denying the Christ of God, and overturning Christianity*, but in stead of proving it he proposeth some questions, *Had Christ two bodies?* Yes: and let him deny it, if he dare, without contradicting the Scriptur *Ioh. 6: 58.* Christ speaks of his flesh which came down from heaven, but this was not the flesh he took from the Virgin *Mary*, for that came not down from heaven, but he had a *Spiritual Body*, in which his Soul existed long before he took flesh of the Virgin; and we will see how *Iohn Brown* proves this to be an error, in the refutation that is promised in his name of *G. K's* book. And for the rest of his conjecturs, such as, *We have two such bodies too*, is but a fiction of his own brain, we call no body of Christ carnal, but believe that that body which Christ took of the Virgin, which was of the Seed of *Abraham* and *David*, in which Christ walked upon the earth, and was crucified, did arise the third day, was glorified, and remaineth in heaven, wherein the center of his most glorious Soul remaineth for ever: and let him shew, if he can, how this is a denying of the Christ of God,

or overturning of Christianity. He proceedeth, *Pag.* 489. at a most violent strain of railing, upon the supposition of his old calumny; and here that it may be compleat, he makes a preaching to the Devil, for which blasphemous abuse I wish heartily the LORD forgive him, that these Devils, to whom he preacheth, be not permitted to give him his reward for his sermon. But seeing he blusheth not to do this in print, I shall not think the many gross abuses I have heard to have been uttered by *Presbyterian Preachers* so incredible, as I have been apt to do, especially that which I have been informed of, of late, of one who at a conventicle in the South, near *Legerwood*, not far from *Lauther*, made a digression in his Prayer to the Devil, saying, *O Devil! thou hast troubled us much with the Bishops and Curats! We beseech thee, Devil, take them to thee, and make us quite of them!* This prayer sutes with *John Brown's* preaching, and indeed the *Presbyterians* will need a new Directory, for the old one, by which they are instructed to preach to men and pray to God, will not serve for this new Ministry, by which they begin to preach and pray to Devils. And of the like strain is his saying, after much railing, *pag.* 490. *that if the Quaker write comments on Paul's Epistles, it must be of Paulus Paganizans*, this sort of stuff is enough to give all sober Christians a disgust of this man's writings. In this page, after some quibbles about *Relation*, he comes, *pag.* 491. n. 11. to affirm that *there may be a Relation which is neither from the nature of the thing, nor from some Divine precept, such as a Promise and Divine Institution*. But is not a Divine Institution a Divine Precept? And whereas he boasts here that my whole discourse falleth, as being built upon a mistake, the Reader may see the mistake is his own, and not mine, and then judge of his discourse, that's built thereon; as also how airy, vain, and ostentive he is, in saying, *What will he now do? His Light has confounded him so as he knows not what he says*. Is this language becoming a Gospel-Minister? That what *Luke* saith, doth not import a perpetuall but temporary command, will after appear. Of what *Paul* saith, *1 Cor.* 10. will be spoken hereafter. To my shewing that *1 Cor.* 11: 26. *Paul* expresseth the end of this ceremony to be a declaring of the Lord's Death, which hath no necessary relation with partaking of Christ's body and blood, he answereth *that a declaration of Christ's Death is a comprehensive end, &c.* And what then? That proves not the necessary relation, nor yet what he adds in this paragraph; therefore I intreat him next time to speak to the purpose. *Pag.* 492. n. 12. He railerth at me, as perverting

## Sect. XIV.

## Of the Lord's Supper.

171

ing the Apostle's words, but giveth no reason, unless his own meer affirmation and querys be esteemed sufficient: he asketh, *What signified Christ's blessing of the Bread, breaking, giving it to his Disciples, desiring them to eat?* *Answer.* Christ blessed the bread, brake it, and gave it to his Disciples to eat, and they to others, where themselves confess no such mystery or *Sacrament*, as they would have here, is deducible, see *Matth. 14: 19. Mark 6: 41.* He insinuates I speak falsely, in saying there is no mention of this ceremony, *1 Cor. 10: 16.* but is not so charitable as to poynt to me where, if there be any such thing. As for his meer affirmations and distinctions here, about the bread, I will wait the next time to have them proved by Scriptur, then will judge them worth the considering. I have shewn in my Apology that the *Corinthians* being in the use of this ceremony, and the Apostle's rectifying the abuse they were in, in the use of it, nor yet its having been done upon a religious account, or in a general respect to the participation of the Body and Blood of Christ; will not prove the necessity of its being now to be performed: and therefore what he saith, *pag. 493. n. 14.* vanisheth. And as for his adding here, that then it was an *act of will-Worship and Superstition*, and that I conclude the *Apostle encouraged such a thing*, whence he taketh occasion to rail at me, as blasphemously imputing unfaithfulness to the Apostle, and to the Spirit of God that acted him. *I answer:* What is done by permission for a time, is not will-worship and superstition, and he confesseth he argues not from the *Corinthians* practice; and for his railing, the ground of it being false, it needs no answer. As for his denying the Jews had such a custom at the time of their *Passover*, his meer negation is not sufficient to elide the testimony of far more credible Authors than he himself in this matter: and as for the words of *Luke*, *Do this in remembrance of me*, it doth not infer perpetual obligation upon the Church in all ages. He raileth at this, but without a reason, *pag. 495.* instancing the Apostles, *1 Cor. 24: 25.* But I told him before, that the Apostle gives here an account of matter of fact, which infers not a command; and in this page the man is miserably pinched to shew how the washing of one anothers feet, albeit commanded with as great solemnity, doth not oblige as much now: but his conjecturs prove nothing. What? albeit it was a custom in the hot countreys, and that it was a signe of Christ's humility, how doth all that abrogat the expresse command to do it? Let him shew an exemption from this from plain Scriptur, for his

meer assertions have but final weight, and by which I am not like, nor yet any man of reason, that is not resolved to set up *John Brown* as a *Pope*, to believe all he saith, from his bare words, to conclude the differences. He thinks, pag. 496. that their not keeping exactly to the method used by Christ in this thing signifieth nothing, but he should prove by Scripture how they are safe in practising one part and not the other, and by what rule he accounts the one part *circumstances*, and not the other; for as to the matter of the thing, he will confess there is nothing in it but by reason of Christ's command and practice, so that affects all parts alike, and indeed he gives a very summar answer to what I urge as to this, as the Reader by comparing his n. 17. with n. 6. of my Apology upon this subject, may observe. It passeth my mean capacity to see any solid reason given by him, pag. 497. n. 18. why *Act. 2: 42.* should be understood of other than their common eating, unless this may be esteemed one, *that to say so, is a meer groundless fancie, like many of the Quakers bold notions.* To prove *Act. 20: 7.* to be understood of *Sacramental eating*, he saith, it required Paul's preaching: but for this we must wait his proof. That Paul preached not upon other occasions, because not mentioned, is but his meer conjecture; and his inference from this being the *Christian Sabbath*, is but a silly begging of the question.

¶ 2. Pag. 498. n. 20. He stateth my words, shewing how the Apostle, 1 Cor. 11. saith, *When ye come together, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper*, and not *that it was not to eat aright*; and I expected his answer to this to follow, but in vain, for I found not any; perhaps he has forgotten it, and therefore I desire he may remember it next: also here in stead of giving a reason to prove the Apostle gives here a command, and not simply a relation of the matter of fact, he returneth railing: I entreat him next to lay aside his railing, and give a reason. That the *Corinthians* were babes in Christ, and some of them even further advanced, I acknowledge; yet that will not prove that somethings might be indulged to them, which is not needfull to us now: the Christians, that had been Jews, were also babes in Christ, and even more, such as the Apostle *James*, who desired Paul to purify himself in the Temple, and yet we are not thence obliged to imitate such practices. Whether the *Syriac* version, mentioned by me, make not to my purpose, I leave to the Reader's judgment; my using it will not infer my acknowledging that version in all things to be authentick, more than his own using it: and albeit I think

it might have been sufficient to have given the words upon the credit of the interpretation in the *Poly-glossa*, yet to shew him how apt he is to fall into false conjecturs, he may know I did it not; and if he could hence, as well as from several other occasions heretofore observed, learn not to lay so much stress upon, and so forwardly vent, his own conjecturs, he would do himself a courtesy. *Pag.* 499. n. 21. He can easily turn-by the Apostle's exprefs command, *Act.* 15: 29. as being a part of of the Ceremonial Law, but I hope he will acknowledge that the obligation upon the Christians, especially such as had not been Jews, to observe it, was not its being a part of the ceremonial Law, but its being now a command of the Apostles, or rather of the Spirit of God, to whom it seemed good so to command, and he should shew next time how this is more abrogated in the Epistles of *Paul* than the other, and particularly how that *Rom.* 14: 17. doth touch the one more than the other. And this command, *Act.* 15: 29 being after the pouring-down of the Spirit, and universal preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles, hath as much of a Gospel institution as any thing commanded before by Christ can have, if not, let him give us a reason from Scriptur, till then his meer assertions, *pag.* 500. will not do the business. To my shewing that this is not to dittinguish the Gospel from the Law, he thinks it enough to say, *this is a Socinian argument formerly spoken to*, and he is very carefull not to weary the Reader with repetitions. I wish he had minded this all along. He also referreth the proof of their Authority to administrat this *Sacrament* to his 17 chapter: but they must be very clear-sighted that can observe any such thing there. And to conclude with some shew of victory, he in a most ostentive way saith that *I have fought untill I can stand no longer, and finding myself weak, and unable to fight any more, I come to something like a parlie*, by saying, Such as out of Conscience will perform this ceremony, as the first Christians did, might be indulged in it: but he concludeth, these things I affirm being proved, none can be supposed to do it out of Conscience. But some may not have such a clear sight of it, and thence may stick in these things: He dispatcheth what more I say as to this, as being a *bundle of groundless whimsies, without truth, sense, or consistency*. But indeed I must say, I wonder to see the man so weak upon this Theam, as well as the former of *Baptisme*, considering they are the great *Sacraments* of their Religion: but it seems his rage in these has robbed him of his reason. I will entreat the Reader seriously to peruse what I

have written upon both these in my Apology, that comparing it with his, he may easily perceive, albeit this reply had not been written, how weak all is; the man brings for the proof of these things.

### Section. Fifteenth,

Wherein his 28<sup>th</sup> Chapter, *Of Liberty of Conscience* is considered.

¶ 1. **A**S he ended his last chapter with railing, so he begins this, comparing the *Quakers* to *Thiers* and *Robbers*, adding, that *their being conscious to themselves of the evil of their ways*, which after he has a little amplified in as black a manner as he can, he concludes that they thought it best for their own safety to add this to the rest of their errors, that *Magistrates have no lawfull power over them*: in which (besides his railing) are two gross Lyes: First, that the *Quakers* are conscious of their own evil ways, and that moves them to assert Liberty of Conscience, which being a gross falshood hath no bottom but his own malicious conjecture, where he presumptuously assumes to judge of other mens hearts. The second is, that the *Quakers* say, the *Magistrate hath no lawfull power over them*, A most gross lye, the contrary whereof is expressly asserted in the *These* in these words, *provided always that no man, under the pretence of Conscience, prejudice his neighbour in his life or estate, or do any thing destructive of, or inconsistent with, humane society, in which case the Law is for the transgressor, and justice is to be administred upon all, without respect of persons*. Who will but open their eyes, may see here the man so desperately resolved to calumniat, that he neither seems to regard his Conscience towards God, nor his reputation among men, that he may fulfill his envy in this particular: but such gross abuses will not hurt but help the *Quakers*. Yea in the very next page he takes notice, that I grant to the *Magistrate* only Liberty to judge in matters touching the life and goods of others, &c. So here is some lawfull Power. As for the malicious insinuation that follows, it needs no other refutation with men of sobriety, but to repeat it, to wit, *But probably not of Quakers, for they are perfect and so can not do wrong*. Is not this solidly and learnedly and Christianly argued, Reader? Thinkst thou, that to say that this restriction is destroyed, because men may pretend



tend Conscience in wronging their neighbours, as some have done, in committing villanies, saith nothing, since the *Proposition* expressly allows the Magistrate to punish acts, that are materially injurious to Civil Society, albeit Conscience be pretended? After, according to his usual manner, he has given us a large citation out of the *Confession of Faith*, and some quibbles about the word *Conscience*, which, as not directly concerned in this debate, for brevity's sake, I omit. Secondly, he comes, pag. 504. n. 5. to say, that I most perversly state the question, in saying, *the Magistrate has not power to compell men against their Consciences*, in matters of Religion. and why? *Because I distinguish not betwixt Elicite and Imperas Acts of Conscience*, that is, as himself explains, *Inward and Outward*; for as to the first, he confesseth the Magistrate is not to compell men, so as to hinder them to think, judge, understand and conclude in their mind as they will, but only in speaking, writing and open profession, which are visible and audible: yea he thinks the Magistrates power doth not only extend on this side to prohibition, but that he may also force them to hear, and to the use of publik means, that is in plain terms, to an outward conformity; and yet he saith, *this is no force upon Conscience*. Well then, *Papish Magistrates*, according to him, used no force upon the *Consciences of Protestants*, in forcing them to hear *Mass*; nor yet the *Pagans* upon the *Christians*, in forcing them to go to *Idol-worships*: and to come near home, the present Magistrates in *Scotland* use no force upon the Consciences of his Brethren, the *Presbyterians*, in the west-countrie, in constraining them to go to hear the *Bishops Curats*, as they term them, where they can not pretend there is any thing of *Idolatry*. As for his distinction of the Magistrates having power of *outward* but not *inward acts*, it were enough for me to reject it, as not being proved by him to be founded on Scriptur, as indeed it is most deceitfull. For if the Magistrate restrain me from doing that outward action, either of confessing to Truth or denying error, abstaining from idolatry or false worship, and practising the true, which my inward perswasion convinceth me of, he encroacheth upon, and takes upon him to rule over my inward perswasion, as well as the outward, which follows naturally from the inward, and without doing whereof, my *inward* could and nothing to me save condemnation, seeing Christ requires an *outward confession*. And if the Magistrates power, as to outward acts, even in matters of Religion, be limited, then he of right may decide and judge of all outward mat-

ters relating to Religion, which *John Brown* may remember his Brethren have strongly denied, reserving that only for the Kirk: for to say, as he addeth, *that the Magistrate has power to punish Hereticks, but not the Orthodox,* is (as I observed) miserably to beg the question, since never any Magistrate was so mad, as to persecut Truth, as Truth, but still under the notion of Error. The sum of what he saith further upon this matter, pag. 505-507, 508, 509. in answer to me, resolves in these two objections,

¶ 3. First, *That my Arguments do no less take away the Magistrates power in Civils.*

Secondly, *That by the same arguments may be denied and taken away all Church censures, which I grant, and in so doing contradict my self, or must answer my own arguments.*

For proof of the First he tels that many Magistrates have been or may be *uncapable to judge in Civil matters as well as Religion, as also have done unjustice in their judgement.* Answ. True, but all this will no ways infer his conclusion, because they still had that which was needfull to the being of Magistracy, that is, being duely to constitute (for of usurpers we do not here speak) however they may want these qualitys which might more accomplish them in their employment, or that they may err in the administration of it; but Christianity, and consequently to judge in matters of Religion, doth not so much as pertain to the *esse* or being of a Magistrate, for if it did, no man could ever have been, or yet could be, a true Magistrate, or ought to be so owned, unless a Christian, which I suppose *John Brown* will not adventur to affirm, or if he do, he will manifestly contradict the doctrine as well as practice of Christ and his Apostles, who preached *Subjection*, and were themselves subject to such Magistrates as were enemies to Christianity. If then a Magistrate may be truly a Magistrate, and ought by Christians to be acknowledged and submitted to, as such, who is not a Christian; to deny to Magistrates that power of Judgment, which they can only have as being Christians, will not necessarily take away any of their power as Magistrates: for Christian Subjects, especially being privat persons, may and ought to submit and obey their lawfull Magistrates, albeit committing errors in the Government, and commanding things hurtfull to the State, and if they do other ways may be justly punished, where the nature of the Government giveth them not allowance so to do. But if the Magistrate shall

com<sup>a</sup>

command any thing contrary to the Law of God, or impose in matters of Conscience, contrary to Truth, *I. B.* will with me confess (unless he condemn himself) that every privat Christian may, without being justly accused of contempt, refuse to obey, as many of *Iohn Brown's* friends do in not going to the *parish Kirks*, (where the same faith and doctrine they hold, is preached) contrary to acts of Parliament. For he hath not proved that a Magistrate by being a Christian acquires more power than he had before, or is more a Magistrate, though he may be a better. For albeit, as he observs, Fathers be desired to instruct their children, which *Pagan* fathers can not do, yet they are not more fathers than before, nor have more authority or power over their children to force them than before: so a Magistrate being a Christian may instruct, countenance and advance Christianity, by the advantage of his place, but acquires no more power thereby to force his people upon that account. *I. B.* if he judge so, will do wel to prove it by Scripture.

¶ 4. The reason of his second objection is, because a Church may err in their judgment, being defective, as he supposed the Magistrate in the former objection, and so may condemn Truth for error. But how weak this is, is very apparent. For if he can shew us a Church having the true being of a Church, which ought to be acknowledged and submitted to by Christians as such, which yet is wholly a stranger to, yea an enemy and persecutor of Christianity, (as I did him in the case of Magistracy) he will say something, but other ways nothing at all. Next, the censur of a Church (however he seems to judge otherwise) can not be called forcing of Conscience, in the sense I grant it, which is only for to deny the persons censured their Spiritual fellowship; since he himself by his differing from them breaks it off (as in my book, intituled *The Anarchy of the Ranters, &c.* written concerning *Church Government*, I have at large shewn) And if the difference be such, as the Church judgeth in conscience they can not have spiritual communion with one so principled, it were in him a forcing of their conscience to urge it upon them: for since he takes the liberty out of Conscience, as he judgeth, to differ from all his Brethren, it were a most unreasonable thing in such a one to deny them the liberty (being perswaded in their conscience they ought) to withdraw from him, seing the band of their unity, which at lest in part was an agreement in doctrine, is so far by him broken; but as he doth not fall upon them, to beat, imprison, or kill them, neither ought they to do so to him.

Y

As

As for his answer, *that they are not for propagating Christianity by force, or that the Ministers should use fire and sword*, pag. 508. it is the same deceitfull return, that the *Pope* and the *Jesuits* his *Janizarys* give upon the like occasion, (with whom the *Presbyters* in most things of this nature do most unanimously agree) who it is said after they have judged any one guilty of heresy, deliver him over to the Magistrate, because alas! mercifull and tender-hearted men! (as is usually spoken by contraries) they will not meddle with blood: but how would they thunder the Magistrate, if he did not proceed to execution? The same way do the *Presbyters*, for we know what naturally follows upon the *Church censur*, or disobedience to their Orders, as by many examples, during the reign of *Presbytery* in *Scotland* might be proved, and which I may instance, if further provoked thereto, by which it shall appear that they are no less *BLOODY* and *CRUEL* than the *Papish Inquisitors*, and that both the *POPE* and the *PRESBYTERS*, assuming the power of judgment to themselves, leave nothing to the Magistrate but the dishonorable office of being their *Executioner*, or in plain *Scots*, *Hangman*, while both most deceitfully wipe their mouths, as if they were innocent of the *Blood shed* procured by them.

¶ 5. In stead of giving any direct reply to my answer to their objection drawn from *Deut. 13.* where *false Prophets* and *Idolaters* are ordained to be killed, he seeks maliciously to infer that I deny all Authority of the *Old Testament*, which is a horrid calumny: But since there are many things commanded there, which himself will acknowledge are not binding upon us now, what shall be the rule whereby we shall judge what we are now tied to, and what not, unless as the same is ratified or again commanded by *Christ* in the *New*? And for clearing of this, let him tell me, if he can, what is incumbent upon us now from the *Old Testament* which hath no precept or authority in the *New*? But further, after he has manifestly wrested the place, to evite what I urge from *Deut. 5:9.* as the Reader by comparing it may judge, at last he confesseth to it, only alledgeth it was a *circumstance*: but seeing this *circumstance* was commanded as well as the rest, he should shew where the one is repealed, and not the other, and how it comes to pass, that it should be duty to obey the one part of the command, and yet *murder* to obey the other, or (if he will) *two circumstances* commanded conjunctly with it, as I hope he will confess it should be for any now to kill their brother or sister as an here-

heretik or blasphemers, without bringing them to a Judge. He has a quick way of answering what I say, *pag. 323, 324* in alledging that it is not to the purpose, as also what I say, *pag. 328, 329.* in answering it by two or three lines of railing, *pag. 513.* But methinks, since he gives his Reader as a reason of his prolixity, that he left nothing said by the *Quakers* unanswered, it is strange he jumps so quietly over that place, *pag. 324.* where I shew that the *Presbyterians* as well as the *Iesuits*, notwithstanding their pretended subjection to Magistrates, and pleadings for the extension of their Power, and accusing us for denying it, do not spare to tyrannize over the Magistrates Conscience, when they can, as by the example of the *Presbyterians* behaviour towards this present King of Britain I did prove: it is enough for him to this to say, *this page is not to the purpose.* But the judicious Reader will rather judge, that he is here so silent, being else where, upon less occasions, so clamorous, because he knew not well what to answer to the purpose. With the like hasty and pittifull stuff he would turn-by the many citations of the *Antients*, brought by me, against *Persecution*, because of his deceitfull *Papish* concession above observed; but he should have shewn how these things of the *Antients* are consistent with the Civil Magistrate using any force in matters of Religion, as being a thing inconsistent with Christianity, which the Reader by reading over these places may easily observe, and thence find why he made such hast, and gave all these citations no other answer.

¶ 6. But as he is hasty in passing over what he finds he can not answer, so, to fill up the pages, he spares not to insist upon trifles, or things of no moment, or which only serve to shew his own folly and impertinency, as in *page 503.* is manifest, where he saith, *he doubts whether it be 25 years since I adjoynd my self to the Quakers.* But whether it be so or not, it nor adds to, nor takes from, the controversy: only to solve him of this doubt, he may assure himself it is not, since I have not yet seen the 30th year of my age. But because I say, it is about 25 years, since they were a distinct and separated People, thence he sayes, *he sees it is not an old Sect, and so has less affinity with true Christianity, because he is sure Christianity is older.* But what Protestant in his wits, if malice did not blind, would use such an argument, knowing how easily the same may be, and has been, objected by *Papists*, that use to ask us, *where our Religion was, before Luther and Calvin?* That Christianity is older than 25 years I am sure: as

wel as he, but it will not thence follow, but that it may be a short time since God raised up a separated gathered visible People, to shake-off the corruptions of *Babylon*, and restore the pure and old Christianity, as it was before the *Apostasy* entred: and if he will not admitt of this to the acknowledgment of his own impertinency, he must needs own the like argument in the mouth of *Papists* to have been valid against our great grand Fathers, and consequently give away the *Protestant* cause.

¶ 7. But the man seems not to have heeded what he wrot in this page, by another yet more palpable mistake, for while in the calculation of the appearing of the *Quakers*, he goes about to find me contradicting another *Quaker*, he sheweth his own senselessness. My account, saith he, of 25 years, being numbred from 1676, will fall in Anno 1651; but another *Quaker* in Anno 1659 saith, it is now about 7 years since the Lord raised us up, in the North of England, &c. Now number 7 back from 1659, my Arithmetik tells me it will 1652, and if I account it 1651, and the other reckon it about 1652, it comes to one reckoning; but *John Brown* will have mine to be 15 years latter, as if 25 years back from 1676 were 19 Years after 7 Years back from 1659, that is, that 1652 is 15 Years before 1651: so far has the poor man missed of his numeration. He sometimes reproachingly and scoffingly sayes, he sees the *Quakers can dream waking*, but it is a question, whether he was dreaming or not, when he proclaimed his fortifhness thus to the world; which can not be reputed an error of the press, since he is at pains to reconcile this imaginary difference, saying, *but perhaps I mean of these in the North of Scotland, the other of the North of England, and therefore he will not contend about it*, he will find he has reason, when he sees his mistake; yet he must have one observation, that, according to the old proverb, *all evil cometh out of the North*: but no wonder, the man has been here benumbed, since he will, ere he want something to reproach the *Quakers*, make use of old Proverbs, albeit to contradict Scriptur Prophecys, *Jer. 50: 3.* where the Prophet speaking of the judgment of *Babylon* saith, *For out of the North there cometh up a Nation against her, which shall make her land desolat. and verse 9. I will raise and cause to come up against Babylon an assembly of great Nations out of the North country.* But an old proverb with him it seems is of more weight, which can hitt the *Quakers*, than the Scriptures, for all the reverent esteem he pretends to them: yet that an Evil hath or may come out of the North, I shall not deny, for of that the PERSECUTING Spirit



Spirit of PRESBYTERY is one example, which as to its rise in *Scotland* was more Northerly than the appearance of the People called *Quakers*.

## Section Sixteenth,

Wherein his 29<sup>th</sup> Chapter of *VVars*, and 30<sup>th</sup> of *Oaths*, is considered.

¶ 1. **A**FTER having classed us, according to his custom, with such as he accounts *odious Heretiks*, for our opinion of *Wars*, he proceedeth with his old trade of malicious insinuations and railings, questioning whether our intent may not be, that we may obtain freedom and liberty to rage over all. And whereas he saith, *he leaves our selves to judge of this*, truly we can sincerely judge, in the sight of God, that this is a gross calumny, of giving any colour for which we are altogether innocent. And like to this is that malicious insinuation, pag. 515. 521. wherein he chargeth us with a *bloody designe, in seeking to reduce them to Paganisme, and by disarming Christians give up Christendom, as a prey to Turks and Pagans*: to which I shall only answer, that, as it is obviously enough malicious, so he shall never prove it true, and therefore I wish the Lord rebuke him, and forgive him for these his *evil thoughts*. What he sayes here, as wel as pag. 517, 518. 522. of the *necessity of defensive War*, to defend from those that justly assault, and Thievs, and Robbers, and cut-throats, &c. he speaks more like an Atheist than a Christian, and like one, who believeth, nothing of a *Divine Providence* of restraining evil men at his pleasur, and not suffering them to go further than he seeth meet. Doth he think that all the endeavours of the wicked men of the world can do any thing, but as GOD permits them? and that all the opposition to such by force of Armes can prevail but by God's blessing? If so, he must not think that such carnal and atheistical reasons can brangle the faith of those, who, out of pure obedience to God, and a desire to be conform to the Image of his Son, according to the measur of the Grace given them, so as to make them think they are less secure, under the protection of the ALMIGHTY, than by their guns and swords. But this is consistent with his faith, the most eminent of

whose brethren have learned to preach with sword and pistols, and in stead of the guard of a Christian boldness and a good Conscience, which the primitive Christians and Apostles used, will be guarded with men in armes, and that in opposition to the authority of those they confesse to be their lawfull Magistrates. And if he say that we must not lay aside lawfull means, I ask him whether he thinks, not to defend a man's self from a principle of Conscience, be simply unlawfull? Let him remember the most remarkable deliverances, that God's People met withall, was, when there appeared least of outward help, and where the arme of flesh had least hand in it, as the children of Israels deliverance out of Egypt, as also *Judges* c. 5: from ver. 16 to the end, 2 *Kings* 6: 17, &c. and chapters 7, 13. & 19: 35. and in other places. To prove that Christ in the 5th of *Matth.* commands no more than in the Law, he referreth to the writings of their *Divines*: but he might have done this all to all he has written, if he judge it sufficient, and so have saved himself a great deal of labour, since he saith elsewhere, *all I have written is confuted long ago.* How men can love their enemies, and yet kill and destroy them, is more than I can reach; but if it were so, such as rather suffer, than do it, do surely more love them, and to do so is no injury to our selves nor neighbours, when done out of conscience to God, in answering our duty to whom we must not regarde our own or neighbours profite. And if what I grant of the lawfulness of *Fighting* to the present Magistrates and state of Christians be considered, it will render all his arguments superfluous, since he confesseth a time will come, in which the prophecy of *Esay* 2: 4. *Mic.* 4: 3. will be fulfilled, and thinks fit there should be a praying for the fulfilling of it: and what if some believe that as to some there is a beginning already of the fulfilling thereof? We do nothing doubt but that of *Rev.* 16: 5, 7. which he mentions, *pag.* 522. will in due time be fulfilled; but we see no necessity of believing that that will be performed by outward fighting, or that the Saints shall need to draw carnal swords, or shut cannons, towards the performing of it. When he saith that the argument of *fighting* is not taken from the corrupt nature of man, *pag.* 519. he must have forgotten himself, since, had not man sinned, and so his nature been corrupted, he may infer, if he can, where there should have been an occasion for fighting with carnal weapons. And since he confesseth that in nothing more, than in warr, is seen the fruits of man's rebellion against God, he may thence see how little need Christians have to plead

plead for it: as for the citation out of the *Confession of Faith*, wherewith to fill-up he closeth his chapter, I know not to what purpose he did it, since no man doubts their faith in this matter.

¶ 2. He begins his 30th chapter, of *Oaths*, with saying, *We deny their lawfulness, that we may destroy all Policy and Government*: But it must only be the Devil's government, for where the Government of Christ prevails, and men speak truth, there all must confess there is no need of Oaths; and also where the like punishment of *Perjury* is inflicted for speaking falsely, the end of Oaths is obtained, and that without breaking Christ's command. Thus according to his own concession, since the verity may be had as well without an oath, none should be urged to take an oath. But let us see what after a citation out of their *Confession of Faith* he saith to answer *Matth. 5: 34.* and *James 5: 12.* which saith so expressly, *Swear not at all*, to this he saith that *Christ is only interpreting the Law, and not adding any thing to it, and that it only relates to ordinary discourse*: but for proof of this he has nothing but an heap of words asserting the thing. To all which, till he bring some Scriptur proof, there needs no answer, but oppose Christ and James words, *Swear not at all*, it is not said, except ye be called before a Judge, let him prove this exception by Scriptur next time, and therefore till he do so, his affirming over and over again that Christ forbade no more than was forbidden in the Law, *pag. 529.* is to no purpose. The Law forbade idle swearing and oaths in communication, but Christ's resumption shews throughout that chapter some more to be urged, to any that understand plain words, and will not shut their eyes. That its being said, *Deut. 6: 13. Thou shalt swear by his Name*, is urged as an explication or comprehensive part of *Moral worship* I deny, and remains for him to prove, or that it was more than a command to the Jews to swear by the true God, that they might not swear by idols; and till he prove this, arguments founded upon it need no further answer. As for what he addeth *8.* to prove *Swearing* not to be of the Devil, because commanded of God, and afterwards concluding that my urging against it, as being of the Devil, is pregnant of blasphemy, because it would infer some of the ceremonial Laws of God to have their rise not from the will of God, but from the work of the Devil, he sheweth here more malice than strength of reason. Was not the command, *Deut. 24: v. 1. Let him write for her a bill of divorcement*, a part of the ceremonial Law? and yet Christ saith, *Matth. 19: 7.* that *Moses* did this *because of*  
the

*the hardness of their hearts*, and is not hardness of heart, which gave a rise to this command of the work of the Devil? Let him then make the application, and then answer the empty bluster he has made of blasphemy. And doth not what Christ saith of this matter of Divorce, *Matth. 5: v. 31, 32.* shew Christ commanded more there, than was commanded under the *Law*? He confesseth, *pag. 529.* that *God can not be said properly to swear*, albeit somethings being ascribed to God makes them not unlawfull to us, yet any things being ascribed to God makes it not lawfull to us, when Christ commands the contrary. That Christ saying *Verily Verily* is more than *yea* and *nay*, I deny, and it remains for him to prove it. That the Apostles asseverations are *Oaths* he affirms in like manner, but proves it not. His thinking we, in being willing to do as much as the Apostle did, *do strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel*, is but an evidence of his railing *genius*, as it doth of his malice in catching what follows, that the question is not *What Paul or Peter* did? but *What their* and our Lord? for that is not said by me, as believing they did swear, or that their words were *Oaths*. But the giving not granting it had been so, to shew it would not prove this thing now lawfull, and that *Peter* and *Paul* both had their failings, though not in that, himself will not deny, which is enough to shew their practice in all things is not to be our rule. His 531 page needeth no answer, being but his own affirmations and conjecturs in stead of answers, these may be considered, when he proves them. That *Paul* swore any way we deny, and neither *Abraham's* nor *Jacob's* practice, nor yet that of Angels will warrand us to imitat them, when Christ has commanded the contrary: and albeit he acknowledge the testimony of *Pythagoras*, *Socrates* and *Plato* doth shame many Christians for their *swearing*, yet he can not omitt here his ordinary reflexion at our Religion, as *Paganish*. He confesseth that many of the *Fathers* were against *swearing*, and indeed none any ways versed in *Antiquity* can deny this to have been the general faith of the primitive Church.

## Section. Seventeenth,

Wherein his XXXI Chapter of *Civil Honour*, and XXXII called *A View of the Conclusion* is considered.

¶ 1. **A**S he enters upon this chapter of *Civil Honour*, he accuseth me as being *effronted* and *shameless*, for saying All our adversaries plead for the lawfulness of superfluity of *Apparel* and *Plays*; and to make this appear the more probable, he would seem to be much against these things, and wisheth there were less of them. But all will not do, nor hide him in this matter, for he will not deny the lawfulness of *Laces* and *Ribbands*, the man will not offend the good *Ladys*, to whose bountifulness they are so much obliged, so as simply to deny their superfluities. And how can he? since it is become a practice of some eminent *Presbyterian Ministers*, which they have learned from their friends the *Papish Priests* and *Iesuitish Emissarys*, not only to go up and down with their *sword* and *pistols*, to evidence they are men of *Blood*, and brethren in *Politics*, but also in their *laced bands* and *cravats*, *perruigs* and *gilded belts*, to make them look like *Monsieurs*. But if he think that I wrong any of our adversaries in this, let him tell me which of them dogmatically hold it as a general principle, that superfluity of *Cloaths* and the use of *Plays* in general is unlawfull, whatever some particulars may do, whereof I made an exception. As for any their laying-aside these vanities out of pride, I do not justify it; for him to insinuat that as to us, is but his bare malicious assertion. After that (pag. 534.) he has told his Reader he comes to treat of that which is peculiar to the *Quakers*, he gives him a large list of strange Heretiks, as among others, *Heracleonites*, *Carpocratians*, *Gnosimachians*, enough to fright ignorant folk, telling, that *what the Devil could not effectuate by all these, he thinketh now to accomplish by the miserable Quakers*. It seems the man must be one of the Devil's counselours, that he is so well acquainted with his purposes, but I shall not cover this his preferment, nor seek to imitat the language he has learned of that *Court*, which he bestows in the following page to rage at us, as *rude* and *uncivil*, and such as deny to give the least signification of *civil honour* to *Equals* or *Superiours*, which is false. And then by a strange figur he will seem no less known in God's

Counsel than he before would appear in the Devil's, and therefore magisterially concludes that God has given us up to the unmaning of our selves, *who have renounced all Christianity, and every thing that looketh like serious Religion.* It seems bowing, and taking-off the hatt, and complemental titles, is this man's Christianity and serious Religion, which the *Quakers* have renounced; I will next examin how he proves it.

¶ 2. *Pag. 536.* He tels that *honour is to be rendered to whom honour is due*, but this we never denied. The question is Whether honour may not be rendered without bowing or taking-off the hatt? The Scriptures he brings here, to prove this, are so far from doing it, that most of them are egregiously impertinent, as will appear; for as to *Abraham's* and *Lot's* bowing there mentioned, I shew in my *Apology* how their practice in that was not to be a Rule to us. But he brings *Act. 14: 15.* where *Paul* and *Barnabas* are said, in our *English* translation, to say *Sirs*, and *Act. 27: 7, 10.* where *Paul* saith *Sirs* to the Mariners, to prove they gave a title of honour, as if *Sirs* did infer the plural number of what usually *Sir* to one imports with us. but if he had looked the Greek, he would have found in both places *ἀνδρες* which signifies *Men*. I would willingly know, if the man will be so void of ingenuity, as not to acknowledge his folly here: for as for the *Jaylour's* practice, he will have much ado to prove it a Rule to Christians. Neither is he less impertinent, when he brings the instance of *Mary* saluting *Elizabeth*, *Paul* the Church of *Corinth*, *Christ* desiring his Disciples to salute the house, and *Paul* in his epistles desiring such as he wrot to, to salute others in his name; for who will not condemn him of folly, in imagining that the Apostle by these Christian salutations desired them to take-off their hats and bow to one another in his name, or that this was the way *Christ* willed his Disciples to salute the houses they came to. He must remember to prove this next time, and know we deny neither *Salutations* nor *Civility*, but have not yet heard him prove that they consist in such practices. He confesseth, *pag. 537.* that several of the titles used may be granted not to be lawfull to Christians, but thinketh that makes nothing for our *blunt and rustik* (as he terms it) *Thou* and *Thee*, with which we speak to Magistrates and great Persons, no otherwise than we would do to our foot-boys. But since he confesseth they use this *Thou* and *Thee*, which he thinks so blunt and rude, when speaking to God, I desire he may acquaint me next time, why they speak to God no other ways than they would do to their foot-boys, to whom I

hope



hope he will say they owne greater respect than to any Magistrates or great Personages whatsoever: and this shews it was no rudeness in me to address my self thus in my epistle to the King, besides that what he quarels being written in Latine shews his folly, since it is usual for themselves writing in that language to use the Singular number even to Kings. And forasmuch as he thinks this so absurd, that in a silly scoff he saith, *under favour of my Thouship*, and Pag. 540. he accounts this in us *singularity, contempt, pride, yea and to proceed from a more stinking root*; I will desire of him to know how it comes that the Bishop of *Canterbury* in the coronation of this present King, in most of his addresses to him during that solemnity, terms him *Thee* and *Thou*, as *Philips* in his history relates, printed at London, Anno 1670, pag. 764, 765. But if he think this of little weight, as being the practice of a proud *Prelat* in his esteem, what will he say of his reverend Brethren the Assembly of Divines at *Westminster*, who teach us in their *Directory* to use this *Thee* and *Thou*, as in the forme prescribed for Marriage, in these words, *T. I. N. do take thee to be my Wife, &c.* He must say, that either they had a reason for this, or they had none, if none, he must conclude them to have been an irrational pack, which I think he will hardly do; if they had, when he gives it, let him free them of *pride, contempt and singularity, or something more stinking*, (to use his own phrase) and find us guilty of it. For his proverb of being *as proud as a Quaker*, we think he has hardly authority to make this pass for one, though by coining this it seems he affects to be a Proverb-monger; but if vulgar proverbs were of any great weight, I could tell him of more antient and authentik, long ago ascribed to his brethren. Pag. 537. he saith, *the terms of Grace and Eminency are not given because of personal enduements corresponding thereunto, but because of Place and Power*. But he should prove that to do so, where these vertues are absent, is either proper or lawfull, since in addressing our selves to any, in saying *Your Grace* or *Your Eminency*, we suppose them to have these enduements, which if they have not, we speak a lye, and that is not lawfull to Christians. To prove the lawfulness of the compellation of *Majesty*, to Kings, he telleth that the Lord bestowed upon Solomon royal Majesty, and *Nebuchadnezzar*, saying, *Dan. 4:26.* that *Excellent Majesty* was added unto him, in both which places it imports no more than an outward glory: but where finds he that any, addressing themselves to Kings, use the compellation of *Excellent Majesty*, as is usual now adays? he will read his Concordance often

over, ere he can find this. As for his jeering me about my *Concordance*, and saying, *I cite Scriptures at random*, for that *Psal. 29: 4. Majesty* is ascribed to the *Thunder*, he but declares his own folly; *Majesty* is there ascribed to *GOD*, for what is ascribed to God's voice is ascribed to him: he may say also then that *Powerfull* in the same verse is not ascribed to God, but to the *thunder*, if he resolve to be ridiculous. What he saith, pag. 540. n. 11. that we *salute no man*, is false; but the question is, Whether there can not be salutations without the uncovering of the head, or bowing the body? this he should have proved. He saith, *Abraham's bowing was against no Law of the Creation, but so was Abraham's practice in the matter of Hagar* (which I brought, to shew that *Abraham's practice* was not to be our Rule) But since *Abraham's practice* in the matter of *Hagar*, and the like practice of *Jacob* and the *Jews*, was permitted to them, and yet thence we are not allowed to do the like, that shews that argument deduced from *Abraham's* simple practice is of no weight. He thinks it silly to say that bowing of the body and knee and uncovering of the head are only external signes of our adoration of God, *because it may as well be inferred that a man must never bow his body to tie his shoes, or uncover his head to have his hair cut*. But this his answer is silly, since men do not these things as a signification of honour, which is the end of their bowing to one another, and the thing here in question; and therefore his repetition of the same in the following page needs no answer. He would make *Mordecai's* case singular, because *Haman* was an *Agagite*, one come of *Agags*: but since he is so good at genealogies, let him prove th's next time, for if the similitude of the name were enough, might we not say with as much reason, that *John Brown* is a *Brownist*? and yet perhaps he would think this a reproach.

¶ 3. But the poor man thinks it's like he has hiet the nail on the head to purpose, when he saith, pag. 542. upon this subject, *One thing I would ask, what he thinketh of that honour and worship, that was given to James Naylor, as he rode into Bristol, Oct. 24. 1656?* I answer, I think it was both wicked and abominable, and so do the people called *Quakers*, who thereupon disowned him and all those that had an hand in it, as by several Letters found written to him, and other papers, if need were, I could at large prove; but it sufficeth to inform the Reader of this, that he was denied by that People, and not any ways afterwards owned by them, untill several years after, that he testified his full repentance for that thing,

Sect. XVII. Of the View of the Conclusion. 189

thing, in a publike assembly, upon his knees, with many tears, signifying the same also under his hand, which also was printed. And thus is swept away his malicious insinuation, *pag. 530.* as to this, and also what his brother R. M. C. saith so often in his Postscript, in terming us *Naylists*, as if I. N. had been the first among the *Quakers*, hence *John Brown* in the list he gives of the *Quakers* Errors of *Civil Honour*, calleth him their first Father: but to teach him not to be so forward to lye next time, he may know that years before I. N. joyned with the *Quakers*, there were hundreds went under that name, and who both preached and practised their way. This may shew the sober Reader, how apt these men are to print malicious lyes, and R. M. C. so frequently seeking to denominate us from that name, because of this, sheweth how frivolous and false it is. I must mind that it were but a just retribution, and no injury done to them, (as this of theirs to us is a manifest one) if I should minde them of no less abominable actions, than ever was or could be proved against I. N. not many years ago done by some eminent among them, who dyed without any sense of true repentance (whereof I. N. gave singular evidence.) What would he think then, if I should thence term them *ists*? But I spare them at present, in hopes they will see their folly, and amend. After this thing of I. N. he ends this chapter with railing, but I observe he makes an entire omission of what I say, *n. 16.* upon the last *These* in my Apology, which I therefore refer to the Reader's serious consideration.

¶ 4 I come now to his last section entituled *A View of my Conclusion*, where coming to examin the few lines wherewith I conclude my Apology, he bestows upon me a flood of most unreasonable railing. I did in that conclusion recommend to the Reader the *system* I had presented to him, of the *True Christian Religion*, which this man here with many bitter words affirms to be other ways, but we must leave the judgment of this to the Reader, when he has seriously read both what he saith on the one hand, and I on the other. And whereas I in my *Conclusion* did shew the Reader, how falsely we are charged with denying the *outward appearance of Christ*, the *real existence of Heaven and Hell as a place without us*, the *Last and General Judgement*, the *Resurrection of the Body*, by telling him seriously, and in the presence of God, that these accusations are false, and that we really believe these things; he with a most effronted impudence reckons it boldness in me, to say so, *pag. 554.* and that because of the testimony of *Faldo* and some others of our manifest Opposers, as if

they should know what I and my Brethren believe, better than I myself do, or should be more credited in giving account of our faith, than our selves. Who can secure themselves from being stigmatized as the Vildest and grossest of Heretiks from the malice of Iyars, if this method be to be followed? But to proceed to shew his injustice and unfairness in this matter in the highest degree, contrary to the rules of fair disputing, and all honest dealing in matters of controversy, it doth manifestly appear, in that notwithstanding in his Title he declares he intends an *Examination of the Quakers Religion*, as the same is presented to the world by me, when he has laboured all he can by turning, perverting, commenting, and divining, to squeeze out of my words all that may seem absurd and erroneous, or at least which he will have to be so, and that he can not find enough there to render the *Quakers* such horrid monsters and Vild blasphemers, as he ever and anon proclaims them to be; then away he runs from R. B.'s Apology, which is the theam of his *Examination*, and comes off with a *But is not the man of this opinion*, or *May we not conjecture that he is of such and such an opinion* (which to be sure is more absurd) as *such and such a man as Mr Stalham, Mr Norton, or Mr Hicks and Faldo relate of such and such Quakers, that say so and so*? Is this justice? Is this Christian dealing? Is this honesty, as among men, in writing against a People not to seek their opinions and faith from their own mouths and pens, but from those of their manifest enemies and opposers? Doth not this bespeak the height of malice with a witness, and shew a determinat resolution to calumniat at any rate? Is this to walk according to the *Royal Law*, to do as he would be done by? Dare I. B. say he would be content to be done so by? Would he judge it equal dealing, if one writing against *Presbytery* should represent them not as they declare themselves to be, but out of the writing of their manifest opposers, as to give credit to *Spotswood's History*, in judging of the rise and growth of *Presbytry*? Would he judge it fair reasoning, if one writing against the *Calvinistical* points of *Reprobation* should in stead of making use of their own Authors, or when he could not make the matter bad enough there, tell the case is so and so, as *Arminius* or *Episcopus* relates it; or one writing against *Protestants* shoule, in the representing of their Principles make use of *Bellarmin* and other *Papish* writers? If this then would justly be accounted ridiculous and absurd, let the judicious Reader judge what character may *John Brown* so doing deserve. But above all is singular-

Sect. XVII. Of the View of the Conclusion. 191

gularly to be noticed *I. Brown* his venerable esteem of his beloved Author *Mr Hicks*, as he terms him, of whom he has so high an esteem, that he hath given him more place in his book than any other, there being no Author, to my observation, so frequently cited by him, who, because this *Thomas Hicks* has been the most abusive and grossest liar and calumniator that has appeared against us, therefore he receives him with the most kindly entertainment; for as malice against Christ of old cemented *Pilat* and *Herod* to put up their privat quarels, so at this day it hath done these men against his Truth and followers, else what should it mean that a fierce *Presbyter* should so heartily embrace a keen *Anabaptist Preacher*, since the same man often upbraids the *Quakers* with their affinity to the *Anabaptists*? Certainly the *Presbyters* caule must be at a low ebb, and he in mighty fear of the *Quakers* prevailing, when he can so cordially shake hands with his beloved *Anabaptist* brother *Hicks*, to help at a dead lift against the *Quakers*, and take him for his Auxiliary with his lyes and forgeries, to make a noise, when other matters and arguments fail. But it had been more wisely done in *I. Brown*, ere he had given the *Anabaptist Hicks* his writings so much place in his book, to have considered the answer to the first dialogue and continuation thereof, written by *W. P.* entitled *Reason against Railing, Truth against Fiction*, and the answer to his third Dialogue, by the same Author, entitled *The counterfeits Christian detected, and the Real Quaker justified*: for I question if *I. B.* will judge it safe to take *implicity* upon trust in matters of controversy of Religion, without examining the word of an *Anabaptist*, unless it be against the *Quakers*, where any witness it's like with him may be admitted, for if he do but speak evil enough, it will be acceptable, whether true or not. And *I. B.* should also have done wel to have informed himself, how this *Thomas Hicks*, being publicly called to an account before several thousand witnesses, for his gross abuses in framing answers in the *Quakers* name, which was never said by any *Quaker*, and in other ways perverting and misapplying sentences of their writings, to questions of his own framing, so that he might make them as impertinent and ridiculous as he was willing others should esteem them to be; did pitiifully succumb, so that his best defence to come off, was to plead the *infirmity of his lungs*, which made him desert the second meeting held for that purpose, and substitute in his place a *free-will Anabaptist* (with whom I suppose *I. B.* will yet have less fellowship) who made a noise and brawling, to keep off the chief

mat-

matter: and yet the grossness of *Thomas Hicks* dealing was so discovered, that some of his own way and others who are not *Quakers* did publicly yea and in print declare their abhorrency of his forgerys, as appears by a book written at that time, entituled *The twelve Pagan Principles considered, upon which Thomas Hicks undertakes to unchristian the Quakers*, and another, entituled *Quakerisme no Paganisme*, and another, *The Christian a Quaker, the Quaker a Christian*, all written upon that occasion by men that were no *Quakers*. Yea *Th. Hicks's* abuses and lyes were so far from doing us hurt, that they were instrumental to bring among us a young *Independent Preacher*, of good repute, and wel received and heard among them, who has told my self, that the reading of *Hicks's* Dialogues and seeing his gross lyes and abuses gave the first rise to his searching after and embracing the Truth; and when *Th. Hicks* and his complices were further pursued by the answer to their pretended narration of these debates, entituled *Forgery no Christianity*, written by *Thomas Ellwood*, and another paper, entituled *A Fresh Pursuit*, by the same hand, wherein he arraigneth the said *Hicks* and his complices of falshood, lying, forgery, and requires them to make them good, or else abide under the just condemnation of so manifest guilt, which they were glad to do, and have not so much as peeped out now these 3 years, since the last of these transactions, untill now this vomit, of which all sober men are ashamed, and from which the Authors have shamefully shrunk, is licked up by *John Brown*, and is become the chief authority of his Tract. Will it favour wel in the mouths of sober Professors, that the chief gun, that *I. B.* useth against the *Quakers*, are the lyes, forgerys and abuses of a shameless *Anabaptist*? Certainly when *I. Brown* considers these things, he will, if malice hath not altogether blinded him, find that he has too suddenly laid hands upon his brother *Hicks*, ere he wel minded the consequence of it, and that so great an infusion of *Hicks's* *Anabaptistical durt*, which takes the best share of not a few pages of his book, will make the rest to stink, albeit it were more cleanly stuff, than it is. And for *Faldo's* books, out of which he copyeth not a little in this chapter, he may find them both answered by *W. P.* the one called *Quakerism a new Nick name to old Christianity*, and the other *the Invalidity of John Faldo's Vindication*, in which, pag. 430, 431, 432, 433. he may find a list of *John Faldo's* miscarriages in citing assertions said by *Quakers*, without telling the books, and of books without parts, chapters end page, of these books falsely cited, of



Sect. XVIII. Of *Robert Macquare's* Postscript. 193  
passages clipt and maimed, and others perverted by additions, and which makes up above 70, to which *John Faldo* hath never had face yet to answer. So that this man may see what kind of authority he has made use of, and how his proofs are bottomed. And lastly, of our full belief of future states, and of the *Resurrection*, he may find a large account in a book called *The Christian Quaker and his Divine Testimony vindicated*, by *W. Pen* and *G. Whitehead*, printed in the Year 1674, from page 146 of the second part to the end.

## Section. Eighteenth,

Wherein *Robert Macquare* his Postscript is considered.

¶ I. AS to R. M. C. his Postscript, which I come now to in the last place, I shall not need to be large, it being a compound and heap of most abusive and unreasonable railing against me and my Friends, on the one hand, and a most sawning manifest piece of nauseating and shameless Flattery to his brother *I. Brown*, on the other. In the very entry he brands our doctrine as the Devil's, and our selves as his Ministers and Amanuenses, and a little after he exclaimeth thus, *O what horrid! what hell-hatched, bold blasphemies this black brood belcheth forth!* And for me in particular, pag. 559, 560. in a few lines he calls me both a Turk and a Devil, and what more his railing Spirit affords him: To all which I shall only say, the worst I wish him is heartily to desire the Lord to forgive him, as by the strength of his Grace I freely do. As to his brother *I. Brown*, he accounts him singularly acute, solidly learned and truly gracious. So that he conceits, if the Devil, who he supposeth drew me on to write, had his dictates again, he would bury or burn them: thence he highly exalts the great depth of this his little Presbyterian David, as he calls him, in the shining light and sharpness of his Examen. Sober men will blush to read such shameless flattery. And truly this Presbyterian Prince looks liker cursing Shimei, than little David; and he himself looks like the daring Philistin, who thus commends him, proclaiming a defiance in his name, as if no solid answer could be given: but such crying of triumph before hand will have small weight with men of reason. His jeering quibble at my words in my book of *Universal Love*, where I speak

overly of the felicity of my understanding, shews he wanted matter, but not malice. Many modest men will be found to have said as much of themselves, neither did I that, as a thing by which I would have any to measure now either me or my writings: the greatest natural understanding (wherein I confess my self freely to be inferior to many) availeth but little, yea often hurteth, to the chief thing *needfull*, to wit, *regeneration*, which by *Grace* and not by *Nature*, and therein I desire to glory. His petty remark upon *Barclay Argenis* is both childish and malicious, he must know that the *Quakers* and my self do both abhor and condemn such books, and truly my love to my name is not so great, that I would have that exempted; and therefore I could freely give my vote, that all *Romances* were burnt, and he will find it hard to prove that such are used by any of us, whereas I know some, who passed, and yet go for pious and *elect Ladies*, among them, that bestowed no small share of their time in reading them, and *Preachers* may be found eminent enough, whose closets are well stored with most approved *Romances*, and some being challenged, even of note among the *Presbyterians*, by some serious professors, for their reading of them, did justify it, as that, whereby they were helped in their pulpits to give their sermons a better lustre. So he may see these books are of more use to his brethren than us, who can content our selves with such homely language, as the holy Scriptur teacheth. For what he saith of *James Naylor* I need return no answer, having sufficiently done it in the former section. And whereas he gives the example of the *Anti-Nomians*, to shew the *Quakers* are not singular, in not being called after a particular person, he doth but miss of his aime, for the *Quakers* are known by that name as such, being an imbodyed People, consisting of several hundred gathered Churches, or Congregations; but the *Anti-Nomians* are only here either some having these particular notions, and no such imbodyed people, else let him tell us where we may find these *Anti-Nomian* Churches. I need say no more to this Postscript, which hath nothing in it but meer railing assertions as to me, and that the rather as I suppose R. M. C. will, long ere this appear in print, receive a solid and grave Letter from an old friend and acquaintance of his, which may make him sensible of his iniquity in this matter, if there be yet any Christian ingenuity abiding with him, and that by prejudice he is not totally blinded.

¶ As for his railing assertions of *George Keith's* book, we will see how  
it

SECT. XVIII. Of Robert Macquarie's Postscript. 195

it is refused in the promised answer to it, and then it will be time to answer them, as to that, as well as to the list of the blasphemous assertions, which they pretend they have gotten out of it: but all Christians may judge how they are like to prove it blasphemous, when, as an instance of the blasphemous assertions, they give G. K's saying, *that the Man Christ Jesus is the Mediator*. And to help them to do their work fully, I desire them, when they go about to prove this assertion to be blasphemy, they may not forget the Apostle's words, *1 Timoth. 2: 5. For there is One GOD, and One Mediator between GOD and men, the MAN Christ Jesus*, and shew how G. K's words are more blasphemous than these of the Apostle; which, to make it more plain to the Reader, I will add thus:

G. K's position, which I. B. and R. M. C. two eminent Presbyterian Preachers, in the Index at the end of J. B's book, affirm to be one of the abominable heads of *Quakerism*, is,

*That the MAN CHRIST JESUS is the MEDIATOR.*

The Apostle his assertion (*1 Tim. 2: 5.*) is,

*That there is One MEDIATOR between GOD and men, the MAN CHRIST JESUS.*

We desire the sense and censur of the Presbyterian Ministry upon this, or otherwise we hope they can not in reason be offended, if justly reputed accusers of the Spirit of God, that taught the Apostles to speak, and thence condemned, as *signal Calumniators and Heretiks*.

---

Here follows the Letter of Lillias Skein to R. M. C.

## Expostulatory EPISTLE,

directed to

ROBERT MACQUARE.

Friend ROBERT MACQUARE,

**M**Y tender Love and Sympathy was great towards many of the *Non-Conformists*, who were suffering tor Conscience sake, and not for interest espousing that opinion, of whom thy self being one, thou was often very near me, notwithstanding I knew generally the *Non-Conformists* are more imbittered and prejudiced against us, called *Quakers*, than any other men; yet this I often constructed to flow from misinformations concerning us, being so little acquainted with and conversant among us, whereunto your being so shy, was but like the Disciples in a *storm* seeing him appear in a manner they had not seen him before, thought he was coming nearer them for deliverance, yet they cried out through fear, as if it had been the appearance of some evil Spirit. Other times I have looked upon the great prejudice many had against us answerable to Christ's saying, *No man having drunk old wine, straightway desireth to drink new, they say the old is better*, which hitherto hath and yet doth cause me bear with you, and love that which is good amongst you, wherever it appeareth. And so because of this love towards thee, I am the more concerned at this time with what thou hast lately published, for, though my acquaintance and intimacy with thee was not so much as others, yet it being in a very serious season with both of us, as I very wel remember, when thou was shut up close prisoner, and was daily in expectation of the sentence of death, thy deliverance from which I retain the fresh sense of, & it was and is with many such like seasons (wherein the Lord prepared my heart, and bended his ear) a sweet encouragement to trust him, and a singular engagement on me to wait for his immediat leadings and the manifestations of his will at all times. But Oh! since I heard of and read thy Postscripts to John

BROWN'S.

*Brown's* book, and *S. R* his Letters, as is supposed, I am astonished, and much ashamed on thy behalf! O! is this the best fruits of so many years affliction thou hast to publish to the world? that one called and suffering as a *Non-Conformist*, (to this sinfull time) should have learned no more conformity to *meek lowly Iesus* (of whom it is said, *he learned obedience, by the things which he suffered.*) Surely none who read thy language, will say, this man hath been with Iesus, but rather say, whosoever's company thou hast been in, thou hast learned to be a cunning Artift at the scolding trade, and art therein vainly puffed-up, that thou even fleest aloft (though with waxen wings) above the lowly, harmeles, meek Spirit of Christ. And verily, had I all thy Rhetorik (whether natural, or acquired) which thou so much misimprov'st, to the gratifying of that which needs more to be crucified in thy self, and many, who are ready implicitly to follow thee; it is not in my desire to follow thy example, nor shall I wish that ever thou have an answer from any of the Lord's People, in thy own terms, which are such as all sober unprejudiced People, who read them, will see thy Spirit most strongly imbibited, when thy pen is so dipt in gall, I say, it is not in my desire to bring forth one *railing accusation* against thee, neither to answer many things thou hast vented against the Lord's present work and witnesses, whom thou despisest and abhorrest more than dung under thy feet, and crowest over, yet, if the Living God (a part of whose host they are) see it meet, he can raise up the least of them, and make thee feel worm *Iacob* a threshing instrument with teeth to deal with thee, and thresh that lofty malicious spirit of prejudice, that breaths through thee: the consideration whereof upon thy own Soul's account is the occasion of this Letter, wherein I desire to lay somethings before thee, which are with weight upon me, my compassions being kindled towards thee, that when the Lord cometh to visit the earth, thou shouldst be found among them, who are *beating their fellow-servants*, the hazard of which state thou knowst, and many will feel, when the Lord riseth up to the prey, for *his eyes are upon the righteous, and his ears are open to their cries*, though now he betraying the children of men, and permitting some to suffer, and others to do hard things; yet a hope lives in me, the time approacheth, wherein the Lord will more manifestly appear to the joy and refreshment of the single in heart, who suffer with him, and patiently wait for him, and for the shame and utter overthrow of his malicious opposers.

And so One of the Particulars I would lay before thee, is, a desire thou wouldst yet in the Lord's Light search thy own heart more, till thou findest out what secret affinity hath remained with thee to any of the Lord's enemies in thy own heart, for if all were brought under the government of the Son of God inwardly, I am fully perswaded thy outward opposition to the Lord's work could not long stand. The outward is a true figure of the inward, and I know by true experience all that despite and disdainfull undervaluing epithets thou squeezeest up thy engine to coyn (which one may feel answers not fully thy own satisfaction) for bespattering and loading that People and their principles, is but (alas!) a mirror-glass set up to represent the low, mean, unworthy esteem thou bearest to the Light of Christ in its inward appearance in thee, as a reprove, for whosoever turneth universally at the reproofs of God's Light in the Conscience, shall witness the pouring forth of his Spirit in larger manifestations, according to *Prov. 1: 23*. But that Spirit speaketh in thee, of which *Isaiah* prophesied, *Isa. 53: 2, 3, &c.* concerning the outward appearance of the same Christ, our Head, and the *Captain of our Salvation* (whose sufferings, death, resurrection and glory we dearly own, and wait from day to day more to see the precious virtue thereof) although he then was and now is rejected and despised of men, who hide, as it were, their faces from him, because his outward appearance was as a root out of a dry ground, in whom there was no form, nor comeliness, nor beauty, that he should be desired by that mind, which was looking after great things, and expecting much outward glory and advantage, and so Christ's appearance was mistaken by the learned Rabbies in that day, notwithstanding they had *Moses* and the *Prophets* testimonys, and were not wanting in reading the letter, as others now; for as it was then, it is now, he was & is mistaken by all, who seek any thing to glory in, save the Cross of Christ, for the wisdom of the flesh hath and doth lift saln man above the innocent Seed in themselves, onely through which they can see the invisible glory of the Kingdom of God, and find an abundant entrance unto the righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, whereof it consists: wherefore take heed of being lifted up above the Seed, Light, Life and Spirit of Christ in thee, and so thou wilt see matter to work out thy Salvation in fear and trembling, and wilt not sit down upon former attainments or experiences, when the Life is gone.



Another thing I would put thee in remembrance of, in these present times, is the great danger of *sinning at the waters of strife*, whereof *Moses* his example may be a standing monument to all generations; of whom it was said, *he was the meekest man upon the earth*, yet at the waters of strife he spake unadvisedly with his lips, because of which he was debarred from entering into the promised rest. And are there not some, living at this day, who, with sorrow of heart, have observed the heat and bitterness of spirit, that hath arisen because of differences and controversy concerning Religion; hath eaten out the life of that love and tenderness that was with many, and having hurt the green thing in themselves and one another, hath brought on death, darkness, dryness, and sensible withering, and can not chuse but so to do, seeing bitterness of spirit and prejudice, and such like frames in man or woman separates from God; while there any one abides? For *God is Love*, and he that dwells in God dwells in love, and Christ hath said *Unless ye abide in me, ye can not bring forth much fruit*, so not abiding in that pure Love to God, and his Image in his Children hath caused many fall short, and hath letted their progress, and made many lose sight of their way, and the *Guide of their youth*, and so they have not followed the Lord fully, nor followed him in the regeneration, renewing according to the increase of Light and the measures of his manifestation; whereby they should know, even in this life, a being *changed from glory to glory*, as by the Spirit of the Lord. Thou mention'st in thy Postscript to *F. B. pag. 557. Many who may remember with shame and confusion of face their laughing at, and making light of the appearance of that prodigy, and that it may cause some go groaning to their grave, being an evidence that ye knew not the signs of the time, and what they called you to do.* To which I answer, Lightness and laughing among people that lay claim to Religion, is none of the least causes of mourning, but I also believe if the appearance of *Quakerism*, so called, had in the beginning been looked on as the fore-runner of the down-fall of a meer man-made Ministry in these Nations; it's like it would have moved those, who laughed most, to have mourned most even then; and Babylon's marchants would have cried Alas! Alas! but since now thou acknowledg'st in the space of a score of years at most, thou seest cause to mourn for that, which ye then laughed at, I am very willing to admit of your own acknowledgment for a ground of hope that the single-hearted among the *Non conformists* may out-live all the clamor they are now

now making against us, and in less than as many years more, may work through the fogs and mists, that now darken their understandings concerning the signs of this time, and look back with shame and confusion on their great darkness that would have mourned for that which was matter of joy: and this is no far fetched consequence, for ye had then, and now the same acquaintance with the letter of the Scriptures, and as much humane learning and sharpness and natural abilities for an acute *examen*, and so it followes by the rule of contraries; and may it not be without presumption concluded, ye needed then, and do now, the help of the *Spirit's immediat teachings in your own hearts*, without which ye will not yet understand the signs of this time aright? which if ye did, ye would see the Lord *staining the pride of all flesh, and bringing into contempt all the honorable in the earth, that the Lord alone may be exalted*, and see him coming out of his Holy habitation to silence all flesh. Hath not the Lord removed most of all those, who were eminently instrumental to serve him in the work of the ministry? and is he not daily making their skirts bare, who remain, and daily making them to cease out of the midst of the National Church, who rejoyced in her pride? Is not his voyce sounding aloud unto such of you as yet remain? Ye shall no more be haughty because of my holy mountain, *if to day ye will hear his voyce, harden not your hearts*, for I am sure the Teacher, that will tell you infallibly what ye are called to do, is near, and is not removed into a corner. But it is the enemies work to vaile and cover present dutys and opportunitys, and represent what is past or lost as very desirable, and even to prompt a people or person to lament and bewail their by-past failings, and short-comings, who do little heed or regard the worth of the remaining season, and so to redeem the time, wherefore my advice, in tender love to thy Soul is, that thou wait on the Lord, to understand aright the import of such signs, as are now appearing, when the Lord is proceeding to work marvellous works and wonders in the earth and is making the wisdom of the wise to perish, and the understanding of the prudent to be hid; and pouring out his Spirit upon Sons and Daughters, servants and hand-maids, provoking to jealousy and angering the mighty learned wise men in this generation by the foolish appearance of a company of illiterat tradesmen, who were never bred up at schools and universitys, weavers and shoe-makers, and fishers. Yea is not one of the dreadfull signs of this time fulfilling in thee and thy

thy Brethren, Rev. 16:8, 9. — the fourth Angel poured out his vial upon the Sun, and power was given unto him to scorch men with fire. And men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the Name of God, which hath power over these plagues: and they repented not, to give him glory? And whether this plague be not poured out upon your Anti-Christian Sun, and ye be the persons, that are thus scorched, your dialect doth sufficiently declare unto all those, whose eyes the Lord hath opened. I also desire thee to consider how inconsonant with true Christianity a spirit of persecution is, and how much more unsutable, and unequal for a people or person under the same condemnation. Surely that poor man, who had been but a little time in Christ's company, was so far influenced by his meek and moderat Spirit, as not onely to forbear rayling himself against suffering Christ, but to rebuke his fellow-companion for so doing, which instance will stand in judgment against thee, for the contrary practice, neither will thy denying us to be members of Christ, and not suffering for wel-doing, thy accounting us Demoniacs, will not avail thee, nor cover thee from that wo, (if thou obtain not mercy to repent) denounced against such as call good evil, and evil good, and Light darkness, and darkness Light, in that day, when the Lord Jesus shall declare before men and angels we are his friends and followers. O Robert! thy hard speeches have manifested thy own sad acknowledgment to be very true, the Holy fire is gone out with thee indeed, in place of which, that, which never was, nor is of God's kindling, is brought forth, and this is not now to be found by secret search in corners by secret surmises: but is by many of you laid open, and in thy late Postscripts, as on a theatre set up, as those, who run, may read the holy fire, if ever there was any, is quite extinct: concerning which compound of unjust groundless accusations and malicious inventions I hope I may say there are many sober serious people, who fear and serve the *Living God*, inward *Jewes* whose hearts the Lord hath *circumcised*, to love him, who desire continually in the integrity of their hearts to serve him, against whom I know no divination nor enchantment of Devils or men shall prosper, of which blessed company I do avouch my self one, through the Free Grace of God, and I hope I, and many with me, have put all thine and thy Brethrens writings in the Lord's own hand to answer, for the vindication of his Glory, and the manifestation of his Truth, and I desire to make no worse use of thy Post-

B b

script

scripts than *Hezekia* made of the writings of *Rabshakeh* in that day, unto the Righteous Lord who *searcheth the heart, and trieth the reins*, do I appeal, for whose immediat help and seasonable powerfull appearance I desire both to hope, and patiently to wait, untill he have performed his whole work in *Zion* and *Jerusalem* both amongst you and us, then shall be brought to pass the sure promise, the Lord will punish the fruit of the stout heart of his adversary, and the glory of his high looks, in that day he will inwardly and outwardly both plead our cause, and execute judgment for us, He will bring forth our righteousness as the light, and make his judgments for us manifest as the noon-day, although we lie among the black pots of your reproaches. Now, the Lord will bring us forth unto the Light, and we shall behold his righteousness fulfilled in you or manifested upon you; my witness is in heaven, I am one, who desires not the evil day, but am willing to embrace all the sweet opportunitys of the drawings of my Father's love and the arisings of his Life to stand in the gapp for the single-hearted among you, and I must declare, for the exonerat<sup>n</sup> of my own Conscience, I am an experimental witness how grievously thou violatst the Truth, in misrepresenting the things, which thou callest the bitter root springing up in these sprouts of hell. 1. Mens not receiving the love of the Truth. 2. Their pleasing themselves with names and notions, while Christ was not received to dwell in the heart. 3. Th-ir not departing from iniquity, who seemed to call on his Name, I am a witness, when the Lord called me out from among the *Presbyterians*, I was one, who according to my education and information and inclination from my child-hood was a true lover of that called the Glorious Gospell, and a constant attender upon the declarations thereof, and the messengers feet, that published it, were beautiful to me, so long as those Ordinances of man were unto me as the Ordinances of Christ, which was more than 30 years, I loved them more than all things in this world, I passed through them hungry, and hardly belted for many years, feeling after Life and immortality, but could not find that, somewhat was raised in me, that words and reports could not feed, names and notions I minded little, but Christ to dwell in me, was that and is that more and more I press after. And now I must for the Truth's sake say somewhat, which I humbly mention with a fresh remembrance of the Love, Power and tender Mercy of God, who enabled me (I know the Lord will not impute it to

be boasting) in that season, wherein the Lord revealed the true way to life and immortality to me, by his inward appearance in my Soul, it was a time, wherein he had mercifully turned me from all that ever his *Light* inwardly and *Law* outwardly had condemned me for, my heart also did bear witness for me that whatsoever I had known would please him, I was chusing to do that, not that thereby I was seeking justification in my own righteousness, but a sure evidence of my interest in him, who was made unto us Righteousness, Justification, &c. This blessed glimpse of my begun freedom was given me in a seasonable time, that I might thereby be enabled to speak with mine enemy in the gate, and be encouraged to believe in the *Light* and *wait upon the Lord*, to feel his virtue perfectly to cleanse me from all filthyness of flesh and Spirit. Neither was I an undervaluer of the Scriptures, they were my Rule then, and I hope for ever my life shall answer them, I think they honour the Scriptures most, who live most according to them, and not they, who call them the *only Rule*, yet do not make them their pattern. The Scriptures of Truth were pretious to me, and by them was I taught not to walk nor worship in the way of the People, the Spirit shewing me his mind in them, and then I saw in his *Light*, that it is not the Scriptures many adore so much as their own corrupt glosses upon them, neither can my experience go along with what thou affirmest of the hazard of converse with that People. It is very wel known to all that lived in the place where I sojourned, I was none who conversed with them, I was never at one of their meetings, I never read one of their books, unless accidentally I had found them where I came, and lookt to them, and laid them by again. So now it remains with me to tell thee what was the occasion I joyned with them, since it was none of those thou mention'st, which I will very singly and can very comfortably do; it was that thing ye school-men call *Immediat Objective Revelation*, (which my desire is ye were more particularly and feelingly acquainted with) whereby the Lord raising in my Soul his feeling Life, I could not sit down satisfied with hearing of what the Son of God had done outwardly, (though I believe thereby he purchased all that Grace and Mercy, which is inwardly wrought in the hearts of his Children) untill I should be a partaker of the virtue and efficacy thereof, whereby I might possess the Substance of things hoped for. I saw an historical faith would neither cleanse me, nor save me: if that could save any, the Devils were not

without a door of hope. I felt I needed the Revelation of the Son of God in me. All that ever I read or heard, without this, could not give me the Saving knowledge of God, *None knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son revealeth him*, through the vertue whereof mine eyes were more and more by degrees opened, for the tender-hearted Samaritan had pitty upon my wounded Soul, when both Priest and Levite passed by, and the watch-men rent my vail, and when there was no eye to pitty, nor hand to help me, he drew near, and poured in wine and oile, as he saw needfull, and fulfilled the promise in measur, wherein he had long caused me to hope, *he that follows me, shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the Light of Life*, and that sweet saying, whereby I am confirmed and comforted, *if evil Parents know how to give their children good things, how much more will the Lord give his holy Spirit to those who ask him? When your children ask bread, will ye give them a stone? or when they ask a fish, will ye give them a serpent?* These pretious Scripturs, and many such like, being opened up and applied by the Spirit of Truth powerfully and seasonably (in saying, *be not faithless, but believing*, times above number before and since hath made me set to my seal to these words of Christ, *The words that I speak are Spirit and Life*, and as I walk with him, and abide in him, *watching at the posts of Wisdoms gates*, travelling in Spirit more and more to bring forth fruit unto him, and walk worthy of him, unto all wel-pleasing, daily to dye unto self, that Christ may live in me, I becoming a passive creatur, and he an active Christ, in the encrease of his Government I feel the encrease of my peace

And so, my friend, thou hast here, by some touches at things, occasion to see how far thou art mistaken concerning us, and how far contrary to the Truth, as it is in Jesus, thou represent'st many things to the world, speaking evil of things which thou know'st not, and if thou dost, the greater is thy sin, two Particulars indeed I can not strain charity so far as to believe thou think'st, do we deny Jesus Christ, and justification through his Righteousness, because we make the sufficiency thereof, of a more universal extent, than ye, or because we love whole Christ so much, and his *seamless coat* that we will not have it divided? Nay we dare not divide *justification and sanctification*, neither confound them, we have felt the *Blood* and the *Spirit* distinct things, yet inseparable: neither canst thou think we make void the Scripturs, because we honour the Spirit that was before the Scripturs were written, and bear testimony against all,

who



who deny the Spirit's *immediat* teachings to be the *universal* privilege of his People, whereby ye take away the key of knowledge, and neither enter the Kingdom, nor suffer others, who would, but monopolize knowledge to your selves, and intrude your meanings upon the Consciences of men, as the Rule, which meanings indeed I do not own, either as the only, or any Rule, but as the Spirit of Christ in my Conscience answers it; the testimony of the Spirit of Truth in thousands with me will stand and rise up against thee, in the presence of the Lord, when all thy unjust reproaches and malicious accusations shall melt away before the presence of the Glory of the heart-searching God, before whose Tribunal I desire daily to stand, that he may more narrowly search me by his *Light*, and both discover and destroy what he finds contrary to his Pure nature and holy will, whether *mediatly* or *immediatly* revealed, and before whose Tribunal thou and I will, ere long, more solemnly appear to give an account of things we have done in the body, which that thou mayst do with joy, and not with grief, hereafter when thou commend'st thy advice to the Readers of thy Epistles, have so much mercy upon thy own and the Souls of those thou writ'st to, as to desire them to ponder their path, and be established, and be sure they be come to the holy faith, and not to an implicate believing the Tradition of men, for by so doing indeed thou and as many as thou canst influence may come to farewell, according to *Prov. 4: 26. Ponder thy path, and be established, and turn not to the right hand, nor to the left.* I am one,

*Who, in my measur, travell for the  
redemption of the Seed of God in all  
Soules, and in thine.*

LILLIAS SKEIN.

Newtyle, the 8 of the  
fourth moneth, 1678.

## A Catalogue

Of some of the many downright Lyes and Calumnys,  
which he asserts, in the *Index* before his book, to  
be the assertions of the *Quakers*.

*All these things he asserts falsely of us.*

1. **T**hat we arrogantly stile  
our selves the servants of  
God.

2. That we glory of the Title  
*Quakers*.

3. That we account our selves  
the only Teachers of Truth, equal-  
izing our selves to the Apostles.

4. That we say we are perfect,  
without sin.

5. That we only tast, see and  
smell the inward Light.

6. That we assert our expe-  
riences, in matters, that can not  
be experienced.

7. That we assert our selves to  
be equal with God.

8. That we say, all is done  
without the Spirit, that is not done  
in our way.

9. That we remain covered,  
when they pray or praise, really to  
mock.

10. That we ascribe as much to  
our own writings, as to the Scrip-  
tures.

11. That we speak basely of  
Learned men.

12. That we condemn the stu-  
dy of Original Languages.

13. That we speak most basely  
of the Scriptures.

14. That we say they are no  
Rule to us.

15. That we call them imper-  
fect.

16. That we dissuade from  
reading and studying them.

17. That we say, God only  
worketh a possibility of Salvation.

18. That we say, God ordain-  
eth nothing from eternity.

19. That we deny Christ's se-  
cond coming.

20. That we are not clear con-  
cerning Jesus of Nazareth his being  
the Son of God.

21. That we acknowledge no  
Christ, but a Christ within us.

22. That we make him no-  
thing but a meer holy man.

23. That a Christ without us  
is but a carnal Christ with us.

24. That we are unclear touch-  
ing the sin of *Adam*, and the fall.

25. That we make Original  
Sin to be a substance.

26. That we deny that Hea-  
thens have any thing of the Law  
written in their hearts.

27. That we say, a Pagan can  
perform all inward worship easily.

28. That we confound Re-  
velations with the gracious opera-  
tions of the Spirit.

29. That

29. That we succeed to the old *Enthusiasts*.

30. That we turn the history of Christ's Death into allegorys.

31. That we wildly describe it.

32. That we say, there is no more advantage to be had by the history of Christ's Death, than by the history of other Saints.

33. That we miserably mistake the judgment of the Orthodox about Reprobation.

34. That in exaggerating the matter of Reprobation we miserably belch out against God.

35. That we deny Faith and Repentance to be the gifts of God.

36. That we vilify the vertue and efficacy of Christ's Satisfaction.

37. That we deny all imputation of Righteousness.

38. That we say, the Patriarchs had no faith of the Messiah to come.

39. That with us all members of the Church are Officers.

40. That we say all Worship must be done by inward Inspirations, as to time, place, and duration.

41. That we make no use of the Scriptures in our Worship.

42. That in our Worship we unchristian and unman our selves.

43. That we deny Magistrates to be lawfull that are not of our way.

44. That we are against giving of all honour and respect to Superiors or equals.

45. That we assert no Heaven nor Hell, but what is within us.

I could have noted several others, which are direct enough lyes, set down in the *Index*, besides not a few he has in the book, which are not in his *Index*, and which the Reader will in this *Vindication* observe. There are also several in the *Index* which are false, and not owned by us, in the terms he writeth them, of which I shall give the Reader a few examples, that he may judge thereby of his fallacy in most of the rest, as where he saith,

1. That we say, the knowledge of the Fall is not necessary.

Now this is false, for we hold it necessary for all, to be sensible of their loss and want; onely we say, a distinct knowledge of the history of Adam's fall is not of absolute necessity to such as God never afforded the means of knowing it.

2. That we deny bodily death to be a punishment for sin.

This is also false, onely we say, that it is not a punishment for sin unto all, but rather a pleasure and satisfaction, according to the Apostle's words, to me to dye is gain.

3. That

3. That with us the preaching of the Gospel is not necessary.

*This is a meer fallacy, for we say the preaching of the Gospel is absolutely necessary, onely we do not think the external knowledge of Christ to be only the preaching of the Gospel, and that the preaching of the Gospel has been or may be, where this is wanting.*

If I should go through the rest of the *Index* thus, I should find very few particulars, in which there is not some such perversion or fallacy, so that very few are set down, as they are truly owned by us; some indeed are, such as

1<sup>st</sup>. *That we deny men to be Christians by birth, for we believe that men by nature are born children of wrath; and yet this may have exceptions, as in the case of Jeremiah and John the Baptist, who are said to be sanctified from their mothers womb.*

2. *That we would have Ministers learning Trades, whereby to live. We truly think it were no disparagement for Ministers to work with their hands, as the honest Apostle Paul did, who commended the same to the Elders of Ephesus, Act. 20: 34. And yet we think a man may be a good Minister, though he have not a trade, and work none, but yet never the worse, if he have one,*

3. *That in Worship we think men should be silent in the first place. Yes, for Silence goes before all solemn actions of speaking.*

4. *That we think to command men to pray without the Spirit, is to command men to see without eyes. Yes, because we know not what to pray for as we ought, without it, Rom. 8: 26. and no man should be commanded to pray as he ought not.*

But as to these which are indeed owned by us, thou wilt find them at large vindicated by Scriptur and Reason, either in my *Apology* or in this *Treatise*. I could have made a further remark in this his *Index*, to shew thee how many of them, he sets down, as our assertions, are not nor ever were asserted by any of us, nor by him affirmed to be so, where he has them in his book, but only his own meer conjecturs and consequences; but I am loath to detain thee any longer in this, by looking the pages, to which he referreth, thou mayst easily observe it.

F I N I S.

